

THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

VOL. 4.

APRIL, 1891.

No. 1.

FOR THE MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

IS IT WORTH WHILE TO GO ON PREACHING ?

BY REV. WILLIAM KIRKUS, M.A., LL.B., RECTOR OF THE (P. E.) CHURCH OF ST. MICHAEL
AND ALL ANGELS, BALTIMORE, MD.

THE question I have written at the head of this paper may be supposed to be one of those which are often said to answer themselves ; that is to say, they suggest alternative answers which are either too obviously true or too obviously absurd to need stating. Thus : Is it worth while to go on preaching ? might elicit the retort, " When the Christian religion, both doctrinal and practical, is acknowledged to be an obsolete delusion ! " Or again, " When our preachers are so stupid and incompetent that they neither know what to say nor how to say it ! " Or again, " When ' faith cometh by hearing,' and without faith men must perish everlastingly ! " Or the question might be simply set aside as having no longer any serious practical interest. Rightly or wrongly, it may be said even Christian people are tired of sermons ; they no longer care for theology ; it is enough for them if they can achieve religion. Anyhow, a subtle and complex science is best taught, if at all, by books. Business men want Sunday for rest. They can manage to keep awake during an abridged service, the parts of which are judiciously distributed between the solos and choruses and orchestral overtures or marches of a " sacred concert," but they are in no mood for being preached to. In fact, so entirely has the music of these " services of song " superseded the rational worship, the " reasonable service " on certain occasions, of our fashionable, well-to-do congregations, that it seems of no importance that the words sung are in flat contradiction to the doctrinal standards of the people of whose " worship " they form a part. I have before me, for instance, a printed programme, of which the following is the title-page : " Church Choral Society, New York. Third season. Eighteen hundred and ninety-one. Second service, St. George's Church, Stuyvesant Square, Rev. Wm. S. Rainsford, D.D.,

Rector. Thursday evening, Feb. 19th, 1891. At a quarter after eight o'clock." Of this " Second service," ending with " Collect and Benediction," the principal part was that beautiful hymn, the *Stabat Mater* ; and lest the plaintive Latin should, to an ordinary Protestant congregation, be unintelligible, lest they should miss the full significance of *Pia mater, fons amoris*, or of *Virgo virginum præclara, mihi jam non sis amara*, or of *per te Virgo sim defensus, in die judicii*, the Latin is translated into English. Nobody can fail to understand the words, *Oh, screen me from the vengeful ire of my great Judge above.* This shows, to be sure, the natural alacrity with which the Christian affections express themselves in the invocation of the *Mater dolorosa*. But what is the use of, at any rate, doctrinal preaching, when all differences of opinion about the objects of worship are rapidly disappearing under the potent solvents of charity and indifference ? Why not say our *Hail Mary* morning, noon, and night, with the rest of Christendom ?

These are some of the ways in which people are continually talking or writing about preaching, and it is surely worth while to consider them. Remembering the past, we can very safely predict that the removal of so potent a factor as the pulpit from the life both of the Church and the world will very seriously alter the product in *some* way. The problem which confronts us in Christendom is not so much to convert an ignorant world as to re-convert an apostate world, or, at any rate, to convert a world which has become indifferent through familiarity. It is, of course, perfectly conceivable that the method most efficacious for one of these purposes may be powerless for the others ; but this cannot be safely taken for granted. Preaching is only a particular mode of employing human language for the purpose of

producing a certain kind of belief, or emotion, or conduct. It is the employment of the spoken as distinguished from the written language; and until oral instruction and persuasion are proved to have become powerless in every other department of knowledge and practice, it may easily be true that they are as effective as ever, and may be made more effective than ever in the department of religion. Preaching, as a particular mode of employing language, exactly resembles the speeches of advocates addressed to juries, or the speeches of those who address political meetings during, for instance, a Presidential campaign. The object of all these speakers is essentially the same—viz., to induce people to believe something; to excite in them a particular state of feeling; and to obtain from them a particular kind of conduct.

Thus between now and the next election an orator on the Democratic side or, *mutatis mutandis*, on the Republican, would endeavor to make his hearers believe that the proceedings of the late Congress really were as he affirms that they were; that certain bills were passed largely by lobbying, bribery, and log-rolling; that they were unjust and in the highest degree injurious to the great mass of the people; that the conduct of the Speaker of the House of Representatives was tyrannical and revolutionary; that by reckless and dishonest extravagance the country had been brought to the verge of national bankruptcy; and the like. He would set this before them not only in such a way as to convince the understanding, but also in such a way as to excite at the same time the deepest or the most tumultuous emotion; he would intersperse his exposition of facts with anecdote or sarcasm or "odious" comparisons, so as to make his political opponents the objects of contempt, or disgust, or abhorrence; he would work his hearers into such a state of excitement that they would cheer and hiss and clap, and throw up handkerchiefs, and wave hats like men possessed. But every now and then he would calm them again; he would praise their honest and noble passion, but he would remind them that the true end of feeling is action; he would explain to them, after every burst of enthusiasm, exactly what they were to do; and he would feel that his success was unachieved until he could be morally certain that he had secured for his candidate or party the vote of everybody who listened to him. And, in like manner, the preacher.—But perhaps before I proceed, it may be well for me to try to define these terms—preaching, preacher, sermon

—or to describe what I mean by them. A sermon, then, is a composition prepared for oral delivery to a relatively large audience; having for its object to impart the knowledge and secure the belief of the facts and doctrines of the Christian religion; to do this in such a manner as to excite the emotions which such facts and doctrines are fitted to produce; and to persuade men, through their intellects and feelings, to a Christian mode of life. Preaching is the oral delivery of such a composition. A preacher is a person by whom such a composition is orally delivered.

These definitions are not, perhaps, exactly accurate, but they will suffice. Of course words spoken to a congregation of listeners may be stenographically reported and printed; but in that case they are no longer sermons, but reports of sermons. Similarly the words to be spoken to a congregation may be written or even printed beforehand. But oral delivery is of the essence of a sermon; and anything, such as writing beforehand and reading or reciting from memory, which affects the oral delivery, will so far also, for better or for worse, affect the sermon. Again, a composition which is not intended to promote Christian edification, intellectual, emotional, or practical, is not a sermon. A London physician—Dr. Stroud—for instance, wrote a very ingenious book about thirty years ago on *The Physical Cause of the Death of Christ*. In like manner the crucifixion of Christ might be treated as a particular case of Roman criminal law. A discourse on the crucifixion of Christ, so treated, would be no more a sermon than a similar account of the crucifixion of the two thieves.

With these remarks we may go back to the question with which we set out: Is it worth while to go on preaching? And it is obvious that we must say no, if the Christian religion itself has become a detected and abandoned delusion. For my own part, I do not believe that the Christian religion is in any such predicament. It might be plausibly argued even that most men are far too stupid rationally and deliberately to abandon Christianity, and for these two reasons: they neither know, with any approach to accuracy, what the Christian religion is, nor the force of the objections that might be plausibly urged against it. Mr. Robert Ingersoll is a very popular lecturer, and has incurred the responsibility of using his not inconsiderable power for the purpose of destroying the belief of hundreds of thousands of his fellow-citizens in Christ and the Gospel. In that endeavor he has very likely

had a com-
success.
mirsers a g
is ridiculo
from the f
never seri
all. Ther
probably n
not at onc
tianty wh
trouble to
its defens
waste an
he had n
by the fal
that grea
we like i
factor in
on Chri
counts of
tinguish
pudent c
of our s
not dam
a great
pertinen
Almight
ple, exa
scandal
English
Again
"infide
guished
sciences
tive. I
belief, a
occupat
seem to
higher
are in a
lief in
specula
lutely v
between
They h
neither
the O
from t
ties of
and h
ment,
at the
seem
Darwi
cles th
tamen
ple of
far m
usefu
More
seem

had a considerable and most unfortunate success. He has produced among his admirers a general impression that Christianity is ridiculous and demoralizing. But, apart from the fatal folly of *proving too much*, he never seriously deals with Christianity at all. There is not a single Church—there is probably not a single individual—that would not at once repudiate that caricatured Christianity which Mr. Ingersoll takes so much trouble to destroy. Nobody is interested in its defence, and nobody would pay a cent or waste an hour upon hearing his lectures if he had not deliberately tricked his hearers by the false pretence that he is dealing with that great religion which has been, whether we like it or not, by far the most powerful factor in modern civilization. His lectures on Christianity exactly resemble the accounts of the characters and doings of distinguished people furnished by the most impudent of reporters to the most disgusting of our sensational newspapers. They cannot damage a great reputation, but they do a great deal of harm by encouraging impertinence and lying. Blasphemy against Almighty God has, for scores of vulgar people, exactly the same piquancy as a filthy scandal about an American millionaire or an English prince.

Again, I believe that very much of the "infidelity" of persons who are distinguished as professors of the various natural sciences is, so far as it exists, wholly negative. It is not denial, but the absence of belief, and can be accounted for by the pre-occupation of the mind by subjects which seem to them to possess, on the whole, a higher interest. Most scholars and divines are in a precisely similar condition of unbelief in respect of many scientific theories and speculations. They have, for instance, absolutely no opinion whatever on the relation between heat and motion and electricity. They have never read Darwin's books, and neither believe nor disbelieve his theory of the Origin of Species. And this results from the fact that both time and the faculties of the human mind are strictly limited; and hypertrophy, not to say full development, in one direction, must often be secured at the cost of atrophy in another. It might seem very strange to a Tischendorf that a Darwin should be more interested in barnacles than in manuscripts of the Greek Testament; but so it was. And to many people of great intellectual power, physics are far more interesting and seem far more useful than metaphysics and theology. Moreover, the methods of physical research seem to them far more certain and the re-

sults far more easily verifiable. Their attitude toward Christianity is not one of antagonism, but of gentlemanly indifference; it is, to them, one of a large number of religious with none of which they are personally concerned. Or, perhaps, they regard it with the mild admiration of men of letters.

The indifference to Christianity of honest and industrious working people as distinguished from anarchists, nihilists, and revolutionists, is also to be regarded, for the most part, as the result of preoccupation of mind; and for that indifference the ministers of religion of all denominations are largely and directly responsible. People who find it hard to make both ends meet are compelled to devote the greatest part of their time and thought to loaves and fishes. If Jesus Christ were to be seen going about the streets of our large cities doubling wages and paying rents, He would have no lack of followers. But everybody knows that He does nothing of the kind, and nobody knows it better than working people. So they plainly tell us they have no time for religion; it is a luxury for the rich. Nor can they be blamed, they claim, for those faults or vices which are the direct effects of the circumstances in which they live. Crowded and ill-ventilated houses and inadequate incomes suspend the operation of the ten commandments. What used to be called sin they boldly describe as disease; and physical laws are allowed to supersede the human will. Amend our social institutions, give us a fair day's work and a fair day's wage, lift off from us the heavy yoke of tyrannical and selfish capitalists, enable us to get decent clothes, so that we can sit in church as the equals of the best people there, and then, they say, we shall be glad to hear your Gospel and join your congregations. Unfortunately it has become the fashion among a certain class—and, unfortunately, a large and an increasing class—even of the ministers of religion, to encourage this way of regarding the misfortunes and even the vices of the poor. They justify, and even invent and propagate, these excuses for sin, which, in point of fact, are sheer materialism, and abolish all moral distinctions. On this theory the "conversion" of the very poor is religiously superfluous; for nobody pretends that a man's soul will be damned for lack of impossible excellences. And, on the other hand, the Christian religion is offered to working people as a form of socialism, a system of truth and life which supplies both a divine example and general principles by which an Irish tenant may determine his just rent and a

New York seamstress her just wages. It takes a very short time and very moderate intellectual powers to demonstrate by actual experiment the absurdity of this preposterous teaching; and when people have once recovered from the fascination of delusive hopes, Cardinals of the Roman Church and Officers of the Salvation Army alike, "charm they never so wisely," will sing their incantations to deaf ears. To the anarchic classes Christianity is, no doubt, detestable, as being by far the strongest existing support of social order.

The neutrality, much more the carefully reasoned opposition, of even a small number of highly educated men who, for various excellent reasons, can always secure a respectful hearing, is a very serious danger to religion. Their power is out of all proportion to their numbers, as indeed it ought to be. Still it may be doubted whether either their number or their power is increasing. The great service they have rendered to religion is, that they have stated with unmistakable clearness the question at issue. That question is: Is the knowledge of anything beyond sensible phenomena within the reach of the human faculties? If not, there is an end, of course, of religion, as there is also an end of scientific certainty. But the question itself is purely metaphysical; and, in its discussion, the naturalist has no special advantage. On the other hand, there is in many directions an undeniable increase in the number of "believers." The agents of the Salvation Army, "evangelists," "revivalists," and such like, assuredly do not present religion to the world in the form most acceptable to refined and educated people. But they reckon their converts by hundreds of thousands; and with a charmingly illogical adroitness they contrive to combine antinomian doctrine with Puritanical rigor of life. We may safely affirm that, if the Christian religion can be propagated at all by preaching, the world will gladly receive it.

But the next objection to preaching is, if possible, more serious than the one I have just been considering—viz., It is not worth while to go on preaching, because your preachers are so stupid that they know neither what to say nor how to say it. Even those who make such a statement would most assuredly admit that it is exaggerated. They put their case strongly for the very purpose of provoking a complete and straightforward discussion. They would certainly allow that Liddon, Farrar, Spurgeon, Dale, Maclaren, Phillips Brooks, H. C. Potter, Henry Ward Beecher, Storrs, Hall,

Taylor—a list which might be increased many fold—were or are preachers who, merely as public speakers, as men who knew what they wanted to say and how to say it, have seldom met their match. Still it is undeniably true that these men are in the highest degree exceptional; and as they pass, alas! too rapidly away, who are rising up to fill their empty places? It is not worth while to discuss such a subject as preaching, if we are to waste time and space on idle compliments. It is much better for all of us to know the very worst of the matter. And the worst of the matter is, we are confidently assured, that a large amount of our preaching is utterly worthless; that thousands of sermons are, as compositions, contemptible; that scores of preachers have never been properly trained for their work, and never will be; that they have neither audible voices nor effective delivery; that they cannot half fill their churches, nor keep the few people awake who are persuaded to come. To this many add, making the worst worse still, that our preaching is deteriorating, and that both our college training and our ideals of clerical life and work are wholly incompatible with effective pulpit ministrations.

I am not inventing these grave charges out of my own head; I am summing up a part of what we can all read any day of the year in newspapers or magazines, to say nothing of what we are continually forced to listen to in private conversation. I read, for instance, in *The Spectator*, London, February 28th, an article on *The Training of Curates*, which is founded partly on a letter from "An Octogenarian Rector." That excellent old gentleman asserts that, in many churches, the first step of the clergyman on the pulpit stairs is the signal for a general *stampede* of people who look "genteel," etc. Almost every Diocesan Conference in England discusses the preparation of preachers, with the distinct understanding, as of an undeniable and admitted fact, that preparation of preachers does not as yet exist; although in England, even now, the large majority—almost all—of the candidates for Holy Orders are graduates of Oxford and Cambridge. In Oxford and Cambridge it may be said that there is no training for the pulpit worth speaking of; and when a young man is ordained deacon and sent as curate to help a beneficed clergyman, his "training" then consists in being taught, by hard experience, how to avoid incurring the odious consequences of exciting the jealousy of a sensitive rector. The excuses for utterly bad

preaching
gested by
are far m
insolence

For in
clergyma
more tha
be—for
allowed
three or
any paris
attend a
when the
his disc
On this
well-educ
man fro
All the
who, pe
also, tru
deal mo
and tha
and rece
favor.
if so, it
ing.

Supp
a youn
were to
from t
number
knowle
might
the pat
very lik
or, if
would
he cou
voted
as wou
what
Our ex
a preac
has no
and th
him a
for o
the po
Or
to a
stump
pose
edge
of it
asser
becau
main
times
denti
fanit
knew

preaching, and the aids and remedies suggested by the devoted friends of the Church, are far more insulting than the outspoken insolence of contemptuous enemies.

For instance, it is urged that a young clergyman should not be expected to prepare more than one sermon—such as that may be—for one or two weeks. He might be allowed to read that same precious sermon three or four times on one Sunday; and if any parishioner were so over-religious as to attend at every service, he might go out when the miserable priestling began to read his discourse the second or the third time. On this delightful theory the first duty of a well-educated layman is to excuse the clergyman from giving any religious instruction. All these excuses are invented by people who, perhaps unconsciously—and perhaps, also, truly—assume that they know a great deal more than the clergy can teach them; and that any sermon is to be barely tolerated and received with the presumption in its disfavor. This, I confess, may be true; but if so, it is *not* worth while to go on preaching.

Suppose we were to give similar advice to a young member of the Bar; suppose we were to suggest that he ought to be excused from taking more than a very moderate number of cases, on the ground that his *knowledge of law* is too limited, and that he might exhaust his resources and wear out the patience of judge and jury. He would very likely tell us to mind our own business; or, if he were exceptionally courteous, he would say that he wanted as many cases as he could possibly get, and that he had devoted many years to such study of the law as would qualify him to undertake *any case whatever* that might be entrusted to him. Our excuses for bad preaching *assume* that a preacher is wholly incompetent: that he has no sufficient knowledge of his subject; and that no sensible person would employ him as a religious instructor if he had not, for one reason or another, a monopoly of the position.

Or suppose we were to offer similar advice to a political "orator" about to take the stump on a presidential campaign. Suppose we advised him to let out his knowledge by dribblets, *because he had very little of it*; and to run no risk of making any assertion that anybody else might contradict, because he would most likely be unable to maintain his ground. "Politicians" sometimes give piquancy and force to their confidential communications by a dash of profanity. But a man of that sort who really knew his business might be excused for

answering the "fool" who advised him, "according to his folly." "What do you take me for?" he might well exclaim. "Do you think I am going on the stump with a week's numbers of the *New York Tribune* and *Times*? I can assure you there is not a politician on either side who can ask me a question I can't answer. Name a politician on either side for five-and-twenty years, and I can give you his whole record. Tell me any measure passed or lost in Congress, and I will tell you its entire history—who introduced it, how it was carried, how it failed. I know every office-holder, every machine, every nickname, every 'pull'; I know exactly what our party wants, what must be done to win, whom to frighten, whom to buy, whom to flatter, whom to despise. Exhaust my material in a few speeches! Good heavens! you don't know what you are talking about. *My materials are myself.* I am soaked with them. I can talk of nothing else. My real danger is that I have too much material, and that I can't help using it, even when it is not worth while." *On the other hand*, we introduce a newly ordained clergyman—or, for that matter, a clergyman of half a century's "experience"—and we say, "Don't be hard on him, poor fellow! how can you expect him to speak *twice a week* on a subject to which he has devoted his whole intellectual power, and on which depends the everlasting salvation of all who hear him?"

Complaints of execrably bad preaching are well-nigh universal. One of the very best books on preaching ever written is *The Ministry of Preaching: An Essay on Pastoral and Popular Oratory*, by Mgr. Felix Dupanloup, Bishop of Orleans, Member of the French Academy. "These examples," he says—meaning St. Paul, St. Augustine, St. Chrysostom—"seriously considered, will tell us better than any description, what is that eloquence which we call *popular*. But let us ask ourselves seriously, Have the addresses delivered among us from the pulpit at all that character generally? The facts and the truth oblige us to say that it is not always thus; no, the teaching which falls from the pulpit is too often not popular; it does not take hold of souls—of all souls; and I speak here, in the first place, of great discourses, of the solemn and dignified teaching which echoes from our principal pulpits; very frequently nothing, it is well known, is less popular than that preaching, and on that account nothing is more inefficacious and more sterile. But I speak, also, of the ordinary pastoral preaching—of that which congregations hear most often—

and which, therefore, ought to have the most influence over them. But if we inquire into the truth as to this preaching, and whether it is really preaching to the people, what do we find? Too frequently that it is quite the reverse. There is not wanting in that preaching another kind of merit than that of popularity; but without *that* other merits are of no value, and do no practical good. And it happens, on this account, that from the want of a practical character which all can appreciate, a character which is essential to a sermon, certain fine discourses lose all their charm, and are not only useless, but wearisome.

"Who is there of us who has not known many men, virtuous and intelligent, even very able, say, 'In truth I know not how it is, but I am no longer able to endure sermons; they fatigue me.' There is assuredly some injustice in this complaint; and the preaching thus blamed would merit to be less severely characterized. But too often, also, in place of finding in our sermons and addresses the simple and practical tone of popular preaching, are they not couched in language which cannot be understood without some trouble? 'And I am not the only one who has the courage thus to find fault. A dull and spiritless phraseology, a hundred times repeated; a desultory mixture of rhetoric, of philosophy, of art, of metaphysical or mystical language, of which no one can comprehend anything; a monotony capable of sending to sleep even those who have lost the habit of sleeping—in truth, I believe that I should do better not to attend these sermons; but, for the sake of good example, I resign myself to submit to them.'

"By no means let it be thought that I go as far as men of the world, or even as men of the Christian world, in casting reproach on the mass of preaching; there have been, there are still at the present day among our sacred orators, preachers truly popular. . . . But it is none the less true that I put my finger here upon a very delicate spot—one of the weak sides of preaching among us, and perhaps the fundamental reason of its too frequent insufficiency; it ought to be, before everything, popular, and it is not."

POPULAR! Yes, indeed. Bishop Dupanloup well explains what he means, what every educated man would mean, by that term. He means having power to convince the understanding, arouse the affections, and determine the conduct, not of a mob, but of a *people*—the whole body of citizens, rich and poor, learned and simple, all who have

conscience and intellect. But to speak of our ordinary young preachers as, in this sense, *popular*, would be "to flatter beneath abhorring." If you doubt it, ask the first six people you meet what they thought of last Sunday's sermons.

Popular! Look at him, and look at him through the eyes of those who, not being parsons themselves, are no way unwilling to describe him with a truly terrific candor. Having duly posed, he begins to *read* a very slender essay, having some remote relation to a passage of Scripture which he calls his text. And the fact of his *reading* it turns the whole performance into a comedy. It is like listening to an exceedingly bad actor playing Hamlet or Iago. First of all, one is disgusted at the sheer impudence of attempting such a part; but by degrees one yields to the absurdity, and the tragedy becomes screaming farce. There is something irresistibly comic in imagining a young man sitting down, perhaps near midnight, with a wet towel round his aching brow, actually to *write* those inane paragraphs. Phillips Brooks may write and read; but then he writes what is worth reading. Think of a professor of mathematics solemnly reading from a manuscript the multiplication table down to twelve times twelve!

It is *not* worth while to go on preaching unless people can preach. And preaching means *oral delivery*. No matter how severe and complete the previous preparation may have been, and it cannot have been too severe and complete, when the time for *preaching* comes, it must be voice to ear and eye to eye. The real *preacher*, the true *orator*, will be governed almost as much by his hearers as they will be governed by him. He cannot possibly predict, in every minute detail, how far what he has prepared in his study will suit even the congregation for which it is intended. But he can perfectly well predict that it will certainly not be suitable for any number of congregations through any number of years. A man who would be at a standstill if his manuscript were blown out of the window may be a great scholar and a sound divine, but is not a great preacher.

It is affirmed that our preaching is even deteriorating; that our "raw material" is like the "sow's ear", out of which no skill can make a "silk purse"; that even our ideal of clerical life excludes the possibility of preaching power. Perhaps this charge is exaggerated, but there is only too much truth in it. I love a splendid ceremonial; no spectacle in the United States can be compared

for im
Mass; a
mean of
at the t
the str
long cl
of the
up Chu
Church
without
the Cat
ness; f
two ye
with a
dismal
—THAT
make i
But
with
love a
all thi
save s
has no
only o
have a
action
lord, f
whom
listen
hands
sion a

Non
—by
any o
practi
ing vo
rouse
much
they
peopl
of p
Cath
how
appr
Divi
mark
lar t
ten
mon
est c
out
ship
men
the
in i
a p
bec
gen
reac
Let
con

for impressive solemnity to a Pontifical Mass; a "master of the ceremonies" is no mean official. But to walk with downcast eyes at the tail of a surpliced procession; to parade the streets of a great city in a cassock or long cloak; to go through a poor imitation of the "Hours" without a Breviary; to pick up Church history and theology out of a Church newspaper or an almanac; to do without books, and find the authority of the Catholic Church in one's inner consciousness; to complete a theological education in two years, with no previous training, and with a knowledge of Greek which has been distally arrested at the end of the alphabet—THAT is *not* the preparation which will make it worth while to go on preaching.

But let a man ascend the pulpit *saturated* with Christian knowledge, burning with love and zeal for souls, ready to be made all things to all men if by any means he may save some; so profoundly humble that he has not a thought of self-glorification, but only of his work and his Master; let him have a natural power of voice and eye and action, and that man will be the absolute lord, for the hour, of the congregation to whom he preaches. He will *compel* them to listen; he will hold their hearts in his hands; he will inflame them with holy passion and conquer them for God.

Nor is *oral* instruction—that is, *preaching*—by any means superseded by the press or any other agency. For it is emotional and practical; and it is not books, but the living voice only which can excite feeling and rouse to action. And if books had very much more power for such purposes than they really have, the majority of religious people read very little. Of the thousands of people who used to throng St. Paul's Cathedral to listen to Liddon's *sermons*, how many would read or could thoroughly appreciate his *Bampton Lectures* on the Divinity of our Lord? And yet those remarkable lectures are so exceptionally popular that they have passed through eight or ten editions. As a rule, even the very sermons which were listened to with the keenest enjoyment are bought, when published, out of mere compliment or personal friendship, and are read with a bitter disappointment. It is scarcely too much to say that the effectiveness of a printed sermon will be in inverse proportion to its effectiveness as a preached sermon. I confess that I am becoming more and more sceptical as to the general amount of intelligent and fruitful reading even among average Americans. Let a clergyman who is the minister of a congregation of eight or ten hundred grown-

up people look quietly round as he makes his pastoral visitations, to get a glimpse of their libraries. I am inclined to think that a very small percentage possess a hundred books which a man of letters would think it worth his while to receive as a gift.

The majority of American men are very busy people. Newspapers they *must* read. They are occupied all day long by the routine and often very exhausting and difficult work of their trade or profession. They get home at night both fatigued and preoccupied. They must have an hour or so, if possible, with their wives and children; and "society" also has its claims. Is it reasonable to expect that they can be kept awake by a treatise on dogmatic theology, or Church history, or the controversy with Rome, or the last and longest complete disproof of the theory of evolution? It is more than they can do, with the tick of the telegraph or the bell of the telephone still sounding in their ears, to fix their attention even upon familiar truths, which address them only with the unobtrusive silence of the printed page. A chapter from the Bible before going to bed seems to get longer and longer every night. The mind, like the body, demands repose, and unless repose can be secured, nature will exact a terrible punishment.

In ninety-nine cases out of every hundred for receiving religious knowledge and religious impressions there is in this country only one day, only one place, and only one method: the day is Sunday, the place is the Church, and the method is preaching. We may think ourselves very lucky if we can secure for this purpose anything like the whole even of Sunday. In our very complex civilization the "works of necessity," which every "Sabbath" law excuses, are rapidly multiplying. Still if men will abstain from reading business letters and despatches, and go regularly to church on Sundays with their wives and children, there is some fair chance for their religious edification. They need be neither over-fatigued nor preoccupied. The weekly day of rest, conscientiously observed, will produce its own habits and moods and expectations as certainly as does the newspaper, the car, the office, the mail of every other day of the week. And for a man seriously inclined, a Church, with its solemn services and suggestive symbols, furnishes the best conditions which could be devised for spiritual improvement. There is sufficient variety to counteract the *soporific* effect—we may as well confess it—of maintaining for a very unusual length of time a merely passive and

receptive attitude of mind. And even with such aids and appliances, nothing, but the living voice of an earnest and competent preacher will arrest and retain the attention.

In any case, to arrest and retain the attention is excessively difficult, and it is sometimes made more difficult not only by the imperfect training, but by the theological accomplishments of the preacher. Let us hear Bishop Dupanloup once again, as he impresses upon his clergy the admirable direction of the Council of Trent, "to preach *cum brevitate et facilitate sermonis, pro eorum capacitate*." "Sermons," he goes on (pp. 31, 32), "with lofty phrases and long periods are not for the masses; they are lost, and cannot follow them. People are like children: they must be addressed in short and compact phrases; then only they understand you, and are attentive. An academic—i.e., a lofty and pompous style—is not a living style for them, and it is nothing more nor less than waste of time to speak thus before ordinary parish audiences. *Cum facilitate sermonis*. You want a simple style—very short, very clear; in a word, a popular style. Brevity and conciseness will do much to give your preaching this necessary quality, and you must study to gain a great clearness of expression. Our habits of mind, our reading, the theological tongue to which we are accustomed, bring naturally under our pens, without our perceiving it, a quantity of abstract or technical words to which the people can attach no meaning whatever.

"Now, gentlemen, reflect: it is truly and simply absurd to pronounce before an audience, which we wish to instruct or persuade, words that they do not understand. That, in writing, such expressions should escape us, who are so familiar as we are with the subjects and the language of philosophy, is perhaps unavoidable; but when we read over our sermon, or the notes that help us to speak, let us be earnest, by a severe revision, to erase without pity all the terms that our hearers do not understand. This word is fine, it is effective, it is learned, but it will not be understood. I efface it, therefore, and put another there.

"To be clear, gentlemen, to be intelligible to all, is the first condition of being listened to; and even though your hearers give the most sustained attention, how can you touch or convince them if you are not understood by them? Every unintelligible word is no longer a word of life; it is a dead word—nothing else.

"Do not fear that this simplicity will injure your eloquence. True eloquence is to

speak so as to be understood, so as to produce in the mind and in the heart of the hearers the effect that the preacher proposes to attain; in the mind, light and conviction; in the heart, persuasion and generous determinations of the will."

This is one of the very strongest reasons for what is called *extempore* preaching as distinguished from reading sermons. The person who is closely reading a manuscript cannot see what effect he is producing on his hearers, and can make no change in his sermon if he does see. Nothing is easier to detect than the eagerness or apathy of a listener. There are scores of sermons read which produce not an atom of effect except drowsiness or disgust; which not only do no good, but deepen the suspicion that listening to sermons is sheer waste of time and temper. The moment a preacher discovers that the attention of his hearers is slipping away from him he should at once change his plan; roll his little manuscript into a ball and drop it on the pulpit floor; trust to his accumulated knowledge, his profound interest in his subject, and his resolute determination to compel men to understand it.

Perhaps, however, the people who press the question I have been dealing with in this paper, and who seem to expect a negative answer, are really thinking about a very different question—viz., How can people be induced to allow themselves to be preached to, or even to go to church at all? However good preaching may be, nothing can enable us to dispense with missionary zeal or with personal appeals to individuals; but neither the missionary work of the laity nor the pastoral work of the clergy comes within the scope of this paper.

THE TSAR AND THE JEWS.

From *The Contemporary Review* (London), March, 1891.

No one was surprised at the rebuff administered to the Lord Mayor of London by the return of the memorial addressed to the Tsar on behalf of the Jews.

On February 1, 1882, a meeting was held at the Mansion House, under the presidency of the then Lord Mayor, in response to a requisition signed by peers and gentlemen of influence who desired, in as public a manner as possible, to call the Russian Government to account for the outrages of which Russian Jews were at that time alleged to be the victims. But the Russian Government were little disturbed by this gathering of

English
some res
affairs, b
Three mo
the law
heard, t
laws hav
their tra
The Gov
either un
Latterly
have for
to them
which th
constitu
terests o
have tak
have iss
May La
and enf
carrying
flicted
ship wh
whateve
has cau
pitiful
and we
horrific
policy

A de
the me
the bec
of prot
larly
assemb
that of
wields
from
Froud
expect
Englis
him o
he ret
He do
help
with
prefer
He do
self a
Guild
troub
Hall
again
peopl
declin
"and
ously
ever
enfor
Ye
the 2

English gentlemen. Naturally, they felt some resentment at the interference in their affairs, but they did not alter their policy. Three months afterwards they promulgated the laws of which so much lately has been heard, the "May Laws of 1882." These laws have, however, been marked more by their transgression than their observance. The Government authorities have seemed either unable or indisposed to enforce them. Latterly, however, the Russian Government have formed the opinion, on grounds which to them seem sufficient, that the extent to which these laws are being broken or evaded constitutes a serious danger to the best interests of the empire. Accordingly, they have taken steps to lessen the danger. They have issued instructions that in future the May Laws of 1882 are to be strictly observed and enforced. As was to be expected, the carrying out of these instructions has inflicted much hardship on the Jews, hardship which all but the absolutely heartless, whatever they may think of the policy which has caused it, must sincerely deplore. A pitiful wail has gone up from the sufferers, and western Europe, which hears it, stands horrified at what it terms the "brutal" policy which has called it forth.

A decade has not passed since the date of the meeting already referred to, but London has been again the seat of another meeting of protest, similarly presided over and similarly requisitioned. The voice of this assembly has penetrated no further than did that of its predecessor. The autocrat who wields the sceptre of Russia is not turned from his resolve. He declines, as Mr. Froude and every man in his right senses expected he would decline, to receive the English deputation who were to interview him on behalf of his Jewish subjects, and he returns the memorial addressed to him. He does not feel that such officious aid will help him and his advisers to cope the better with the difficulties of this question, and prefers to remain unencumbered with it. He does not see why he should trouble himself about a meeting held in the London Guildhall any more than our Queen would trouble herself about a meeting in the Town Hall of St. Petersburg convened to protest against the alleged coercion of the Irish people. Not only does His Imperial Majesty decline with "one stroke of his pen" to "annul those laws which now press so grievously on the Jews," but he seems more than ever resolved that those laws shall be strictly enforced.

Yet friend and foe alike bear testimony to the Tsar's excellent personal qualities, to his

innate humane and pious disposition, to his many domestic virtues. This being so, is it not clear that something has hardened this Sovereign's heart, some strong motive dictated this stern policy? It is not reasonable to suppose that this policy has been adopted from mere caprice. What motive, then, has actuated it? Surely until we have discovered the motive, and considered its sufficiency, even as partial excuse, if not total justification, it is only fair that we should withhold our condemnation of the Tsar and his advisers. Further, in interfering at all with the Tsar in his internal policy, we adopt a course which cannot but fail to make bad blood between the two countries, and we expose ourselves to a retort such as that which appeared in the St. Petersburg *Novoye Vremya* of December 18:—

"The concern of England," this paper sarcastically remarks, "which has beggared the population of India and Egypt, which has poisoned the people of China with opium, which destroyed like dangerous insects the natives of Australia, and which under pretext of abolishing the slave-trade is now exterminating in most wholesale fashion the numerous races of Africa—the concern of a people who do these things is certainly touching."

With many other people in this country who do not see in the existing government in Russia, in reference to this question, that object of detestation which fills the vision of so many estimable English folk, I have been expecting to see some reply to the many bitter attacks which from time to time in our magazines and newspapers have been made on the Jewish policy of the Tsar. I had thought that, keenly sensitive as the Russian Government are to all aspersions on their character, they would by this time have found some competent writer to put their case before the British public. Madame Novikoff appears to think that her country can afford to be indifferent to the opinion of the world, but she cannot but know that international opinion is now a force which has to be reckoned with. She would have done better, I think, if she had devoted the energy which she expended in endeavouring to turn the Guildhall meeting into ridicule to penning a plain statement of the case for the Russian Government. Her epistles to the *Times* were certainly amusing, were indeed to a certain extent warranted, but they were by no means calculated to allay the feeling aroused in this country against the policy of her Sovereign.*

Failing any exposition of the motives of

* Since this was in type, I have been pleased to notice a report in the newspapers stating that Madame Novikoff is preparing a pamphlet on the subject.

the Russian Government from an authoritative source, and thinking it to be a pity that any unnecessary bad feeling should exist between England and Russia, I feel it incumbent upon me, an Englishman of many years' residence in Russia, to place before the English public a few facts and deductions which may serve to throw some light on the attitude of the Russian Government towards the Jews. At present, if we are to rely on the articles which have already appeared on this subject in English periodicals as a full and sufficient statement of the problem, the Tsar's policy would appear to be either wholly motiveless, or actuated by the most sordid and wicked considerations. Turning to the article on this question which appeared in the *Fortnightly* of October last, I search in vain for any clear expression of the writer's opinion as to the motives of the Russian Government. I find quoted at the head of the article a passage from the song of Rabbi Ben Ezra :—

"Something is wrong, there needeth change,
But what or where?"

but I cannot discover any satisfactory answer to the inquiry. I read an able summary of the laws affecting Russian Jews, and a heartrending description of the sufferings of that ill-starred people, but there the argument seems to end. We are not even informed, as the *Spectator* has pointed out, how it happens that the Tsar does not feel "the usual impulse of despots to protect the lowest class in the community, one, too, which is unresisting to a fault." The article in *Blackwood* of the same month is similarly incomplete. Yet to Mr. Lanin

"it is a matter of wonder that so very little should be known and so much rashly written in this country about Russia,"

and to the writer in *Blackwood*

"nothing is more remarkable about Russia than the general ignorance in Europe concerning the social condition and internal affairs of that country."

Surely, from gentlemen so anxious to dissipate the crass ignorance of the average Briton on Russian questions, some enlightenment on the all-important point to which I have referred was only to have been expected.

Mr. Lanin is frank. He owns to being perplexed when he asks himself what has called forth the hostility of the Russian Government. "It is not," he says,

"the Jewish religion that is so unrelentingly pursued, for it is admitted even by the orthodox Church to be superior to Mohammedanism, which enjoys toleration in Russia. Neither is it the Jew-

ish race, for once a Jew adopts Christianity as his 'faith,' he is placed on a level with born Christians. It cannot be the supposed economical influence for evil exerted by the Jews, for the same evils complained of, only in much larger dimensions, are to be found in other parts of the Empire, into which a Jew never sets foot; and yet [mark the words] objectless as this persecution evidently is from any reasonable point of view, not only is it warmly advocated by a portion of the press, but a fiendish delight is taken in contemplating the results."

In other places he writes: "The powerful government of the Tsar is employing all its pecuniary resources, and all the ingenuity of human hate to crush them [the Jews] out of existence." "Alexander III. is resolved to grind the Jews down to the intellectual level of his orthodox subjects," and "Russian Judophobes—many members of the Government included—positively take a pleasure in the disgusting conditions in which Jews exist."

I read somewhere that Mr. Lanin "always seems to exaggerate." Will he not himself admit when he reconsiders the words which I have quoted from his article not only that he has *seemed* to exaggerate, but that he *has* exaggerated? No fair-minded opponent of the Russian Government will, I feel sure, go all the way with this powerful writer in such violent phrases.

However, if we are to ascribe to the present Government the diabolical intentions which Mr. Lanin imputes, we must ascribe these also to most of their predecessors right back to the time of Catherine I. For, according to Mr. Lanin's own showing, the Jewish question has been as much a trouble to successive Russian Governments as the Irish question has been to successive English Governments. How was it, may I ask Mr. Lanin, that the Empress Catherine I., after the annexation of the province of Little Russia, found it desirable to order the expulsion of this intelligent and harmless people from that territory, and that the gentle Peter II. could only find it in his heart so far to relax this order as to permit Jews to visit South Russia for the purpose of attending the fairs there? How was it that the Empress Anna found it desirable to withdraw the permission she had given to Jews to visit her country for purposes of commerce, that the Empress Elizabeth felt obliged to frame more stringent laws, and that the enlightened and philosophic Catherine II. saw fit to pursue the same policy, modifying it eventually only so far as to permit Jews to settle in the government of New Russia, a concession which constitutes the foundation of the famous Pale of Settlement, "the main grievance of the Jews and

the source of all their sufferings"? How did it happen that Alexander the Blessed failed in his effort to bring about the brotherly union and ultimate amalgamation of the Jews with the Russians?

Is all this exceptional legislation to be ascribed, like the laws of the present reign, to sheer devilry on the part of the rulers of Russia? The hypothesis is unreasonable and unwarrantable. Even the speakers at the recent Guildhall meeting, one and all, steered clear of uttering so outrageous a libel on the Russian Government. The writer of the article in *Blackwood*, too, prefers to leave the question of motive alone, rather than make an attack of this kind. All that he ventures to say, by way of explaining the cause of the hostility felt in Russia towards the Jews, is, that "it is chiefly as a trader that the Jew excites the jealousy of his neighbour," and that "though the Jew middleman is often useful he is decidedly an unpleasant character, and contributes much to the unpopularity of his race."

The promoters of the Guildhall meeting would seem to be as much in the dark on the question of motive as the writers of the articles in the magazines. They leave us to infer it from the resolution moved by the Duke of Westminster, which ran as follows:—

"That, in the opinion of this meeting, the renewed sufferings of the Jews in Russia from the operation of severe and exceptional edicts and disabilities are deeply to be deplored, and that in the last decade of the nineteenth century religious liberty is a principle which should be recognised by every Christian community as among the natural rights."

This resolution consists, it will be observed, of two distinct propositions, which, so far as their wording is concerned, might be presumed to have no relation to one another. Separately considered, no more innocent-looking propositions could have been framed. Few would hesitate to subscribe to them. But, of course, nobody present at the meeting regarded them in this way. They were intended to be read as cause and effect. It was desired that the Tsar of Russia should understand that, in the opinion of the citizens of London, the exceptional legislation referred to in the first proposition was the effect of his not recognising the principle referred to in the second proposition. The sting of the resolution lay in the juxtaposition of its component parts. Otherwise the resolution is meaningless.

We may therefore take it as the opinion of the "Citizens of London in Guildhall assembled," notwithstanding the terms of the memorial do not seem to support it, that

the Jewish question is at bottom a religious question.

I do not agree with these "citizens of London." I am one with Mr. Lanin in the opinion that the Jewish question is *not* a religious question. Religion, to my thinking, no more enters into it, than it did into the Jewish question with which some four thousand years ago the Pharaoh "who knew not Joseph" had to deal. I assert that the Russians are the most tolerant of people on religious subjects. If you are not orthodox, they look upon you as lost, but they do not add to your misfortune by persecuting you. Rather, they pity you. During the whole period of my residence in their country I have never once, English and heretical as I am, been attacked by Russians on the score of my religious opinions. I have not enjoyed this immunity when in England and other countries. Catholics and Dissenters alike have attacked me. In Russian villages, Tartars, Lutherans, and Catholics may be found living side by side with orthodox peasants on most amicable terms.

No, in all seriousness, it is not religion which is at the bottom of the trouble with the Russian Jews. The real cause is much the same as it was in Pharaoh's time.

"Now there arose a new king over Egypt which knew not Joseph, and he said to his people, Behold the people of the children of Israel are too many and too mighty for us: come, let us deal wisely with them; lest they multiply, and it come to pass that, when there falleth out any war, they also join themselves unto our enemies. . . . And the Egyptians made the children of Israel to serve them with rigour. . . . And Pharaoh charged all his people saying, Every son that is born ye shall cast into the river, and every daughter ye shall save alive" (Exodus, chapter i., revised version).

The children of Israel of the present century are becoming "too many and too mighty" for the people of Russia, and the modern Pharaoh is endeavouring in his own way to reduce their number, and to weaken their power. Like his prototype he considers his best plan is to make them "to serve with rigour," to make existence harder for them. Perchance, then they may be induced to start in search of a new Canaan. He will not refuse to let them go. No heaven-sent plagues are necessary ere he will give his consent. The very presence of the Jews in his country is, in his opinion, plague enough. He would be only too well pleased, if a Moses were to arise to lead them across his western frontier.

Fear, then, and not religious bigotry lies at the root of the Tsar's policy toward the Jews. Rightly or wrongly, he and his advisers consider that they have reasonable

grounds for regarding the Russian Jews in their number and their peculiar characteristics as a real menace to the stability of the Empire. They strive, therefore, in obedience to the "First Law of Nature" to preserve their own existence. Are they to be blamed?

We are now come to the crux of the matter, to the important question: Do these reasonable grounds exist? Before any one can give an accurate answer to this question, he must first rid himself of all personal bias against either Russian or Jew, and then listen to, and carefully weigh, the arguments of both parties.

Probably, the most important, and at the same time most moderate, statement of the case for the Russian Government, is to be found in the article on the Jewish Question in "Contemporary Russia,"* the work of M. Skalkoffsky, Vice-President of the Russian Mining Department, a travelled and well-informed man. No English translation of this book has, I am told, yet been published, and I shall therefore refer to the article in question at considerable length.†

Dealing with the origin and growth of the Jewish Question, M. Skalkoffsky points out that

"The Jewish problem in Russia is a legacy from the Poles. The lazy and unprincipled Polish nobility, incapable as they were of independent action, were glad of the assistance of the Jews in exploiting a down-trodden peasantry, and thus their country soon became the nucleus to which the Jews were attracted. When a part of the country was annexed to Russia, it became imperatively necessary to relinquish the existing policy of ignoring the Jews altogether which had been favoured by Peter the Great and Elizabeth, the former saying that he had rogues enough among his own people, and the latter that she desired no material benefit from the enemies of Christ.

"The question had to be considered seriously, and the Government, taking the only course at all practicable, secured to the race comparative freedom of action in the particular districts where they had been settled for centuries, and even invited them to populate a part of South Russia then very thinly inhabited; taking the strictest measures, however, to prevent the farther spread of the race into the remaining portion of the Empire.

"In time, however, the strictness of the laws became relaxed, and the Jews spread into the interior, causing the same complaints to be uttered on every side as had been made against them in the western provinces. Here the state of affairs soon became almost unbearable, especially about the middle of the seventeenth century, when the influence of the Polish nobility in Russia was at its height. The remedy proposed by the partisans of the Jews was to abolish the Pale of Settlement altogether, and by permitting the Jews to settle anywhere throughout Russia, to assist them to lose themselves among the native population.

* "Sovremennaya Rossiya." 2nd edition. 1890.

† For the translation of this article I am indebted to Mr. Alex. Coates, of St. Petersburg.

"Unfortunately, this hope can only be treated as an illusion. The idea of grafting the race on the natives would perhaps be tenable if we could imagine the necessity, or rather the scope, required for the utilisation of the peculiar talents of the race. As we have said elsewhere, the class of business men which the Jews almost invariably belong to should form a very trifling percentage of the entire population.

"It is, moreover, a matter worthy of consideration, seeing that the Jews multiply with such astonishing rapidity under their present conditions, what is to be expected if they are permitted to live at the expense of the whole empire?

"The disturbances in Rostoff on the Don, Ekaterinovsk and Nijni-Novgorod plainly demonstrate the untenable nature of the theory—which, however, was never shared by the Government—that the distribution of the Jews in small portions among the population throughout Russia, in other words, the suspension of the Pale of Settlement, is the best means of solving the Jewish problem. In the towns named the proportion of Jews is very insignificant, yet the disturbances plainly prove that even so small a dose of the national distemper is more than the popular organism can support.

"This may be illustrated by a few more instances. We learn from the official report of M. Augustinovitch, published by the *Pravitelstvenni Vestnik*, that the colonisation of the Island of Sahalin was observed to be making most satisfactory progress until lately, when a few Jews appeared among the convicts. With their advent all was changed. The most stringent measures taken by the Governor and his officials proved unavailing. The secret sale of spirits was introduced, and while the Jews succeeded in acquiring small fortunes, the convicts of other religious persuasions lost everything, including the assistance which was given them by the Government on having served their time. Scarcely a single Jew performs the hard labour allotted to him, as he is always in possession of the means to hire other convicts to work for him, while he himself carries on his illicit trade, and gradually robs his fellows of the last of their possessions."

On the fecundity of the Russian Jews, and its bearing on the problem, M. Skalkoffsky observes that

"according to ancient writings, the Jews first made their appearance in Kieff during the tenth century, and since then their number in the south-western governments alone has attained the formidable figure of over two millions.* The significance of this figure (which is slightly below the actual truth) will be perceived if we take into consideration the following well-known facts. With few unimportant exceptions the Jews are not personally concerned in any productive industry, but almost invariably occupy a sort of intermediate position as middlemen, petty traders, agents, brokers, etc., between the producer and the consumer. Without denying the utility of this feature of trade, it is necessary to bear in mind that so enormous a proportion of middlemen is far above the requirements of the country. In France, when the population exceeded forty millions, the proportion of individuals occupied in all the branches of commerce was computed at about 1,800,000, and there can be no comparison made between the trade of France and that of the south-western governments of Russia. Being essentially a migratory people, the Jews simply

* There are now over 6,000,000 Jews in Russia.

inundate the present instance, the which has of the race its present close of the Jews come hordes. A the propor of the pop to 7.4, whi complete growth of an increase of 1859, th remaining towns as, Podolsk, and Shklo that of the Jewish el surely ind tions emi however c the Judo paper pul Odessa p which de populatio which wil fulness co made of f which the settleme register o accordi Jews wer mean inc populatio births ov found to was 628, increase rapidly t will be c subject o over eigh contracte of all pe significat bear in fourth c enormou points un affluence may be h ise. Th tian mar 4.54; an rate dur Jewish Christia per cent ous that their am frequen the tend tion obs conditio growth

As to for evi

inundate this or that point according to the opening presented to their trade. It is well known, for instance, that the emigration of the Jews to Odessa, which has resulted in the alarming preponderance of the race now existing in that town, only assumed its present proportions quite lately. Towards the close of the sixth decade of the present century the Jews commenced to pour into Odessa in regular hordes. A census taken in the year 1859 shows the proportion then borne by the Jews to the mass of the population of the town to have been as 1 is to 7.4, while a second census in 1873, a very incomplete one, shows that, notwithstanding the growth of the original population, which showed an increase of over 50 per cent. against the census of 1859, the proportion borne by the Jews to the remaining population was as 1 is to 3.7. In many towns as, for instance, Vilno, Titomir, Kramenetz, Podolsk, and others, not to mention Berditschiff and Shkloff, the number of Jews greatly exceeds that of the Christians. The steady growth of the Jewish element in the district in question would surely indicate that the race had fallen into conditions eminently favourable for its development, however clamorously the opposite may be urged by the Judophiles. In an exceedingly interesting paper published in the Address Calendar of the Odessa police by the local Statistical Committee, which deals with the fluctuations observed in the population of the town, figures were produced which will serve to demonstrate the degree of truthfulness contained in the numerous complaints daily made of the supposed hardships and oppression to which the Jews are subjected within the pale of their settlement. On comparing the death rate with the register of births during 1883, in the classifications according to the various religious persuasions, the Jews were found to be particularly favoured. The mean increase among the Christian portion of the population, by a preponderance of the number of births over the number of deaths registered, was found to be 78.2 individuals, while that of the Jews was 628.5! Thus the Jewish element is shown to increase by natural means alone *eight times more rapidly* than the Christian. A similar disparity will be observed if we turn our attention to the subject of marriage. During a period extending over eight years, the total percentage of marriages contracted was 65.59 per cent. between Christians of all persuasions, and 34.41 between Jews. The significance of these figures will be perceived if we bear in mind that the Jews alone constitute one-fourth of the entire population of Odessa. So enormous a difference in the number of marriages points unmistakably to a difference in the relative affluence of the two elements. A few further data may be interesting as tending to confirm this premise. The average number of births to every Christian marriage during the eight years alluded to was 4.54; among the Jews it was 4.63. And the death rate during the same period was 37.13 per cent. of Jewish infants, and 48.08 per cent. of those of Christian parents, thus showing an excess of 11 per cent. in the mortality of the latter. It is obvious that the peculiar characteristics of this people, their amazing fecundity, their early marriages, and frequent divorces in cases of barren unions, as also the tendency to mutual support and combined action observable in them, tend to create for the race conditions eminently favourable to their further growth and development."

As to the "supposed economical influence for evil exerted by the Jews," which Mr.

Lanin asserts cannot be the cause of the hostility of the Russian Government, the author of "Contemporary Russia" has much to say.

"The Jews are," he continues, "*par excellence*, a commercial race. In Russia they are gradually insinuating themselves into all the various branches of commercial enterprise. The vitiating effects of this movement are observable everywhere, yet a few particulars which would serve to illustrate the principles on which the Jew brokers and petty traders conduct their operations may be worth the reader's attention. The official *Vestnik of Commerce and Finance* thus describes their mode of procedure in the most important of Russian industries, the grain trade:—

"The Jew-buyers are rarely possessed even of the means of depositing an advance of ten or twenty roubles on a parcel of grain; the purchase is therefore arranged by a Jew broker, whose commission-money amounts to one rouble on every waggon-load of grain sold. The goods are then warehoused, the person under whose superintendence this is done receiving fifty copecks per waggon-load, another thirty copecks being paid to a third Jew who attends to the despatch of the grain and makes out the receipts and other necessary documents. The buyer then deposits the railway quit-tance in a Jewish counting-office, and receives the full value of the grain, paying a discount of from one to one-and-a-half per cent. for every ten days. Only then does the seller receive his money for the grain he has sold. To the expenses enumerated must be added a considerable loss on the grain incurred by the seller through the petty swindling of the Jews connected with the transaction. These swindles have often formed the subject of articles in the Russian periodical press, and so deeply have they taken root in the trade, that a special slang vocabulary exists among the Jews to express the various forms which they take. The liquor trade in all its branches is almost entirely in the hands of the Jews, though the numerous methods resorted to by that talented fraternity render it rather a difficult task to ascertain with any degree of accuracy the extent to which they are concerned in the various subordinate features of the trade. The commonest method employed is that of running an establishment in the name of a Russian, who, for a consideration, procures the necessary papers, and in some cases attends in a great part to the business. Again, it occasionally happens that the Jew who is the real proprietor figures in the papers as the servant of the nominal proprietor of the establishment."

"These frauds are conceived and carried out with remarkable intelligence and caution, so that the revenue officers and the police are practically unable to detect them, and, except in a few isolated cases, the Jew is allowed to carry on his illicit trade in undisturbed security. In the meantime the system is carried on with true Jewish effrontery, so that, for statistical purposes, the Jews do not even trouble themselves to conceal their connection with the trade. Thus, it is officially known that the percentage of drinking-houses of all kinds illegally held by Jews is thirty-five throughout Russia, while in the south-western provinces particularly, where the Jews form a recognised element of the population, the proportion of public-houses owned by them is nearly eighty-nine per cent.! Thus, while complaints are daily being made of the persecution to which the race is systematically

subjected, more than ten thousand Jews are allowed to disobey the laws specially promulgated for their restraint. It is necessary to bear in mind that the pale of Jewish settlement in Russia includes, besides the south-western provinces, only fifteen of the governments of Russia proper. In the remaining districts the Jews form, happily, only an accidental contingent of the population.

"We will pass over the governments in which the Jews are not numerous, and devote our attention to that portion of the Empire which has been laid open to the race, and in which there are actually more Jews than there were in Judea in the days of Solomon. Here we find that, until very lately, this down-trodden and cruelly persecuted people owned more than one-half of the entire number of distilleries, nearly three-fourths of the breweries, seven-eighths of the wholesale spirit warehouses, nearly one-half of the number of public-houses, and a similar proportion of drinking-saloons, wine cellars, and beershops. Comment would be superfluous. The figures speak for themselves."

Mr. Lanin urges that these evils are to be found in larger dimensions in other parts of the Empire into which a Jew never sets foot, and that they cannot therefore be the cause of the present trouble. The writer in *Blackwood*, too, observes that

"official statements have proved that the rate of interest paid by the peasants to the Jewish usurer in the western provinces is far lower than the rates charged by the Russian *koulak* in the provinces from which the Jews are excluded. The *koulak*, too, enforces his claim with rigour, whereas the Jew, unsupported by the authorities, has frequently to compromise, or even accept a total loss."

As to this, the author of "Contemporary Russia" writes as follows:—

"It is often argued that the people suffer no more from the Jewish middlemen than they do from the native *koulaks* and *miroyeds*. We are ignorant of a single instance of public resentment of which the *koulaks* or *miroyeds* have been the object, while instances where the populace have been incited to demonstrations against the Jews are familiar to every one. It is obvious, therefore, that the populace must make some distinction between their native persecutors on the one hand, and the Jews on the other."

This distinction, M. Skalkoffsky maintains, does undoubtedly exist. "To begin with," he continues:—

"The *koulak* is a native product, his education and moral training do not differ from the education and moral training of the community in which his operations are conducted. He is in most cases illiterate, and, in general with the ignorant, possesses a wholesome appreciation of the inconveniences connected with the law. He is not averse to an occasional carouse with his compeers, and is in no way connected with others of his calling, invariably working for himself. It is natural, therefore, that the people should see in the *koulak* merely one of themselves, with no points of difference except the energy and consistency necessary to enable him to make capital out of the weakness and stupidity of his less capable fellows.

"In the case of the Jews, the opinion of the populace is based on entirely different considerations. The Jew is a product of a civilisation entirely foreign to the village community on which he lives. His religion, his moral training, his customs, all differ materially from the customs, the religion, and the moral training of the Russia peasant. He is never quite illiterate, and far from possessing the horror of the law observed in the *koulak*, he actually prefers that means of settling his disputes, and consequently very frequently resorts to it. Having absolutely nothing in common with the rural community in which his operations are conducted, their ostracism has no terror for him; nor does he, like the *koulak*, act individually, but invariably is in close communication with all the Jews in the neighbourhood, by whom he is advised and assisted. With the *koulak* the peasant is able to treat on common ground: with the Jews, an element entirely foreign to his own sphere, the *miroyak* has no common ground to treat on. The relations of the Jews to the Christian community are, moreover, regulated by the degree of affluence of the latter. If there is neither a sufficiency of wealth, nor a reasonable facility offering for trade, the Jew, being absolutely parasitical in his instincts, soon rides the place of his presence, and proceeds to some more promising neighbourhood. The *koulak* cannot do this; he is bound by the ties of birth and relationship to a particular community; there are for him no 'fresh woods and pastures new.' Thus, while it sometimes happens that a *koulak* relinquishes some of his predatory habits, a Jew is practically incorrigible.

"Taking the statistics of a government like that of Kherson, where the Jewish contingent of the population is comparatively inconsiderable, we find that for every ten individuals of the native population there is one Jew. If we then turn our attention to the fact that *koulaks* or *miroyeds* are not to be found in every village, and that sometimes in a small town, with a population of upwards of three or four thousand, not more than ten *koulaks* can be pointed out, the disparity in point of numbers is still more obvious."

Mr. Lanin and the writer in *Blackwood* have not denied the extreme unwillingness of the Jew to become a soldier. On this peculiarity of the Jewish character, M. Skalkoffsky says:—

"The recruiting system is in every possible way avoided by the Jews. A report issued in 1876 showed, for instance, that, notwithstanding the strictness with which the rules of conscription were enforced by the Government, the result was not what was expected. Even the revival of an ancient statute which provided that, in cases where the defection of Jews caused a deficiency in the number of recruits, the number wanted was to be supplied from among their own people, has not improved matters, for in the same year, of twenty-three per cent. not answering to the summons, twenty per cent. were Jews! The figures of other years give still more astonishing results; thus in 1878, of the entire number of recruits who did not respond when called on, eighty-seven per cent. were Jews!"

I purpose now giving the views of a Russian journalist, whose name is more widely known than M. Skalkoffsky's, and who expresses himself in more energetic fashion.

I refer to
Graschda

As ever
known per
tion his
posat tha
spread be
admissible
he will ex

"There
in twenty
Jews. Th
yond recov
ble diseas
not live
renders hi
We cannot
parts of th
in a simila
and ignor
must ther
France th
know how
trary is th
the Jews a
able to do
distance, lo
They ruin
morally we
bine toget
uce far be
in their p
him mon
thing into
erties are
Press, and
our coun
sions they
Soon they
we seem
poses, a J

Prince
an extre
the Jew
find him
gards th
feed on
social o
got rid
be destr
to inqu
To the
Dr. He
time b
persecu

His
perhaps
were no
and the
nin is
Majest
organ
privileg
hear, t
at the
alleged

I refer to the editor of the St. Petersburg *Graschdanin*, Prince Metchersky.

As every one in Russia is aware, this well-known personage has made the Jewish Question his hobby. According to him the proposal that the Jews should be allowed to spread beyond the Pale is altogether inadmissible. If approached on the subject he will express himself in this wise:—

"There are already in Russia six million Jews; in twenty years time there will be twenty million Jews. The condition of the Jews is hopeless, beyond recovery. Like a man afflicted with a terrible disease, the Jew seems only to exist; he does not live. His affliction does not kill him, but it renders him to all intents and purposes lifeless. We cannot allow him free rights of residence in all parts of the Empire, for our peasant would soon be in a similar plight. The *mozjik*, in his simplicity and ignorance, is no match for the Hebrew. He must therefore be protected. In England and France the masses are sufficiently wideawake to know how to protect themselves. Here, the contrary is the case. Moreover, with such freedom as the Jews already have, they have shown themselves able to do incalculable harm to Russia. For instance, look how they have spoilt our grain trade. They ruin the peasant farmers financially and morally wherever they get the chance. They combine together to bring down the price of his produce far below its natural value, and get him wholly in their power by selling him vodka and lending him money. Look how they are getting everything into their hands, restricted even as their liberties are. They are becoming paramount in the Press, and they practically control the finances of our country. Even in the law and other professions they are making themselves indispensable. Soon they will have us at their feet. Like Austria, we seem destined to become, to all intents and purposes, a Jewish Empire."

Prince Metchersky takes, it will be seen, an extreme view on this question. Fearing the Jews as he does, it is not surprising to find him very bitter against them. He regards them as destructive microbes. They feed on and promote the degeneration of the social organism. They must therefore be got rid of. And "when microbes have to be destroyed, we do not," he says, "pause to inquire how microbes like the process." To the cynicism of this remark the Rev. Dr. Herman Adler called attention some time back, when preaching on the alleged persecution of the Jews.

His views on this question would not, perhaps, demand much attention, if they were not to some extent shared by the Tsar and the Russian Ministers. The *Graschdanin* is regularly perused by His Imperial Majesty, and is also in some degree the organ of the Government officials and of the privileged classes. It will be interesting to hear, therefore, what the Prince has to say at the present juncture concerning the alleged persecution of the Jews. In an

issue of his paper in September last, I find an account of a most interesting conversation which he had had with an Englishman on this subject. The enemies of the Prince charge him with carrying on conversations with imaginary individuals, and then printing them in his paper as *bonâ fide* interviews. In the present instance, however, the conversation was not imaginary, the English interviewer being Mr. Barnes Steveni, the St. Petersburg correspondent of the *Daily Chronicle*.

"One day," begins the Prince, "amongst the numerous 'dead souls' that visited me, was, if I am not mistaken, an English correspondent, who inquired why I was for ever attacking the unfortunate Jews. Having placed my interrogator in a chair, I replied: 'The Jews, as you know well, are everywhere; they are, moreover, not only unbidden guests, but very unwelcome ones. In Russia they possess a peculiar significance. As you probably know, in some districts of this country the Jews have all the rights of residence; in other districts they are allowed to live temporarily on certain conditions. The trouble at the present time is occasioned by the Jews endeavouring to obtain the right to live everywhere without restriction. With this end in view, they and their Russian allies have circulated the following paradox—viz., 'The Jews, when confined to one spot, may possibly become a source of danger to the Empire, but distributed all over the Empire, they will grow up and intermingle with the mass of the Russian people, and so become harmless.' This is absolutely false. In those districts where the Jews have the right of settlement they are identified with the natives so much that they have become predominant, and compel the latter to see the necessity for living as they do. The case is quite different when they invade a new district. There, then, at once begins a struggle for existence between them and the native population. Jews can endure far more suffering and deprivation than Russians. They have also greater energy and fixity of purpose. They pursue every path, and especially every crooked path, which enables them to creep to the top from below. The end of the struggle, therefore, generally is that the Jews succeed in stifling the life and enterprise of the original inhabitants. They are *trichina*. They fasten on and embed themselves in the muscles and nerves of the local organism, consume them by degrees, and ultimately destroy the whole organism.*"

"This, in the first place, is why the Government, acting in pure self-defence and for the safety of the Empire, should under no pretence and in no case whatever permit the settlement of Jews outside the legal boundaries of the Pale of Settlement."

"No!" exclaimed my interlocutor. "Where, then, are the Jews to go? It appears that in the districts where they are allowed to reside they are already too numerous. Formerly they numbered only four millions, now they number six millions. What is to be done with the remaining two millions?"

"Allow me to explain," said I, in answer, "that I and my paper are at loggerheads with the liberals and humanitarians of the present day upon this

* Here the Prince refers particularly to the exploitation of the south-western provinces by the Jews, who, not being allowed to own land or forests, exhaust the former and cut down the latter without any regard to the welfare of posterity.

very point. The question—What is to be done with the Jews?—must, according to my firm conviction, be solved by the Jews themselves, and it can be solved by them. In no case is it the business of the Russian Government or of Russian society to solve it. For the Jews there is a legally-defined Pale of Settlement, no more and no less. Where they should go when they become cramped for room is no business of ours. Let them go where they like.*

“Why not let them go to Siberia?”

“The Lord preserve us! The Government would make a great mistake in giving them any such permission. Siberia! why in that country lies the whole future of Russia.”

“But look at us in England,” replied my Englishman; “we neither persecute the Jews nor have any complaints to make about them.”

“In the first place, excuse me, I will raise an objection to the word ‘persecute.’ Nobody in Russia persecutes the Jews. This accusation is an abominable lie concocted by the Jews themselves, and circulated in all the Jewish papers of Europe (the name of which is Legion). There is no truth in it; not an atom of truth. It is only a big ‘tit for tat.’†

“The Government in this matter, as in all other affairs, have begun to act with firmness. They demand that the laws shall be carried out and that greater respect shall be paid to the authorities. In the past the Jews, profiting by the laziness and feebleness of the Government officials, have managed, it would appear, by all kinds of methods, to obtain for themselves various illegal positions in Russia. These infringements of the law are no longer permitted. They are, as in other countries, regarded as deliberate breaches of the law.‡ The Jews now begin to make an outcry, to call the legal demands of the Government ‘persecution.’ At one time the peasants were allowed almost to hew down the forests, and to pasture their beasts on anybody’s land. Even when caught on the spot they were let off almost scot-free, to such an extent had the administration of the law become weakened. At the present time, however, all trespassing and forest exploitation is impossible without sure punishment of the guilty parties following. Now, will you not agree with me that it would be very unreasonable of the peasants to begin to deafen our ears with outcries of ‘persecution,’ merely because they are not allowed to continue to break the laws with impunity? The case is exactly the same with the Jews.”

“In the second place, there is a vast difference between England and Russia in regard to this ques-

tion. England is too full of the English, who are too energetic and self-reliant a race to have reason to fear the Jews. In England the Jews are only in the crevices. It is the same, only in a less degree, with France. French blood is too hot, too boiling over, one might say, to allow the Hebrew blood to overcome it. In France the Jews have only occupied a position amongst the higher intellectual and financial classes. But there is a country in Europe where the Jews have met with a more passive resistance. That country is Austria. And what do you see there? There is no more an Austria, no more a Hungary. From top to bottom there is only a kingdom of Jews! The villages belong to Jews, the Ministry is a Jewish office, the palaces are temples of Hebrew cult; and the hour of the political death of that Empire has approached terribly near.

“Yes, when I look at Austria, I am dreadfully alarmed for my own country. Russia, also, is a passive Empire. It is not noticed how the Jews are everywhere increasing, and when it is—it will be too late. The Jews are not creeping into the chinks, they have already crept into them. But they will not stop in them. They will advance farther and farther. They will sit everywhere, openly and in high places, meeting from our people no active opposition. What will happen, should they succeed in breaking through the dam and inundating the country, will be an outburst of popular vengeance which is to be feared, in no case desired. That this should not happen, that the Jews should not conquer Russia as they have conquered Austria, it is essential that the laws relating to the Jews should be strictly carried out, that none great or small should be allowed to break these laws to their profit.”

By the publication of these pessimistic views Prince Metchersky raised quite a storm in the Russian press, and became the object of much abuse from Judophile quarters. A series of eloquent letters soon appeared in the *Novosti* from the pen of M. Gradoffsky, a Russian, yet a staunch Judophile, who essayed to prove that Jews are no worse than other people, and that Judophobic views are not held by people of repute. Space does not permit of my stating M. Gradoffsky’s argument. I can only say that though this champion of the Jews writes powerfully, he does not appear to me to state anything that would induce the Russian Government to adopt a different policy.

During the past few months I have spoken on this subject to Russians of all classes, and on my asking why Jews should not be allowed to spread all over Russia, I have generally been met with the ejaculation, “*Gospodin pomeele pastiednaika roobaska sneemant*” (“The Lord have mercy upon us; they would take our last shirt and become our masters.”) My inquiries have convinced me that the objection to the Russian Jew is based on material as opposed to spiritual considerations, and that the Russian Government are not only not guilty of the charge brought against them of objectless persecu-

* Mr. Steven here did not mean as exiles, but as tillers of the soil. Southern Siberia is not only almost uninhabited but is extremely fertile.

† This reference to the power of the Jews in the Press seems to be founded on facts. Nearly all the telegraphic agencies of Europe are either directly or indirectly owned or managed by Jews. The Russian Government have discovered that the Jewish telegraphic agencies and the Jewish newspapers of Europe have of late years been systematically used for disseminating false reports about Russia, the object being chiefly to depress the value of the rouble when convenient to the big Jewish bankers and speculators on the Exchange.

‡ It may be observed here that Russian officials, by their extreme corruption, make the law worse for the poor Jews than it otherwise would be. A rich Jew can buy almost any privilege; a poor one is completely at the mercy of the authorities. This state of affairs is, it must be admitted, a great stain on the administration of justice in Russia, and the Government should set about improving it by every means in their power. They would be well-advised if they paid their officials better, and organised a better system of supervision. If the laws against the Jews are necessary, they should be enforced equally on rich and poor. Russia, however, is not the only country where complaints are made of there being one law for the rich and another for the poor.

tion, but policy wh

Is it no Russian I it not also than eno not the R Settlement Jews? I of the E the peas ground f rights of take to a they wou men?

concern the latte to take "aggress their pre protection

A disc your ow superior let the sup "Would peasant against he mak peasant which w I hear s the un prey to rather f for the that it possible out of ant cer princip tion is too, of dustry, amount the Jew drink,

The be well icy—vi place of whose mate of "C Jews days i then s

"As

tion, but to some extent are justified in the policy which they have adopted.

Is it not a fact that the tendency of the Russian Jew is to act as a middleman? Is it not also a fact that there are already more than enough middlemen in Russia? Are not the Russian peasants within the Pale of Settlement completely in the hands of the Jews? Is it desirable, in the best interests of the Empire, that this demoralisation of the peasant should spread? Is there any ground for hoping that Jews, if allowed rights of residence all over Russia, would take to agriculture? Is it not certain that they would swell the ranks of the middlemen? Are Jews or Russians the chief concern of the Russian Government? If the latter, are not the Government bound to take steps to protect them from the "aggressiveness of the Hebrew?" Is not their present policy calculated to afford this protection?

A disciple of Mr. Darwin may say, "On your own showing, the Russian Jew is the superior of the Russian peasant. Why not let the superior survive?" I reply: "Is the superior in this case the fittest?" "Would the Jew till the soil as the Russian peasant does? Is not his whole record against him as a tiller of the soil? Would he make as good a soldier as the Russian peasant?" These are the considerations which weigh with the Russian Government. I hear some one else say: "Granted that the unsophisticated *moujik* falls an easy prey to the Jew, is not that an argument rather for the education of the *moujik* than for the repression of the Jew?" I reply that it is an argument for both. It is impossible to educate the peasant until he is out of the clutches of the Jew. The peasant certainly needs educating. But the principal subject on which he needs instruction is agriculture. He is sadly in want, too, of instruction in the advantages of industry, thrift, and sobriety. But no amount of good advice will benefit him if the Jew is always at hand to ply him with drink, and "help" him with money.

The Russian Government may therefore be well advised to pursue their present policy—viz., to make Russia an undesirable place of residence for those of their subjects whose presence does not make for the ultimate good of the country. As the author of "Contemporary Russia" points out, the Jews must be convinced "that their halcyon days in Russia have gone by." They will then soon rid the country of their presence.

"As it is," this writer proceeds, "no small per-

centage of the race emigrate to America, and it is in America and Western Europe that their sterling qualities will receive the acknowledgment due to them. Instead, therefore, of encouraging them to overrun Russia, it would be wiser, as the *Noroye Vremya* says, to persuade them to spread west, where they form at present only a fraction per cent. of the population. For this purpose neither the application of force nor any other old-world measure is required. It will be sufficient to elaborate a plan of legislation which will render their farther sojourn in Russia moderately inconvenient to them. Easily evaded statutes, professing to protect the revenue from their encroachments, or forbidding them to travel in Russia, have been proved inadequate, for the country is overrun with the Jews, and inundated with poisoned spirits. What is really necessary is a measure prohibiting their settlement under any pretext, however plausible, outside the prescribed pale, or engaging in any trade calculated, directly or indirectly, to place the peasantry in their clutches. The schools should be reorganised on a thoroughly Russian plan, and intermarriage with Christians freely permitted. The crowning measure, however, would be an income-tax to be imposed on the more affluent of the Jews, the proceeds of which should be utilised as an emigration fund for their poorer brethren. Count Ignatieff once very aptly remarked to the 'Universal Jewish Alliance' that the Jews in Russia were a perfectly free people, 'for,' said he, 'the western frontier is wide open to them.' The only difficulty is, that the emigration of the Jews, to be at all considerable, requires the material assistance of the Government, as it will be the poorer class that will leave the country. As the enormous incomes acquired by the Jews in Russia are, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, the proceeds of elaborate swindling, the victim of which is the Government, the latter has obviously a perfect right to tax them, though were it to be proposed to tax the Jews in the interests of the Gentile, the measure, however just in principle, would bring all the fat into the fire in an instant. All that is claimed, however, is that a moiety of the wealth which is daily passing into the hands of an obnoxious race should be utilised for the benefit of its own members. To render the measure beneficial it would be indispensable to ensure that a Jew on once receiving the sum assigned to assist him out of the country should not be able to return and claim it a second time. For this purpose it would be necessary to forbid once for all the entrance of Jews into the Empire, whatever the pretext, were it only for twenty-four hours, were it on the staff of a diplomatic corps, or were it with a proposal to pay the national debt twice over!"

As reported in the newspapers, the policy of the Tsar is having its designed effect. Thousands of Jews are finding that life in Russia is no longer worth living, and are starting in search of a less inhospitable shore. No fresh legislation has been found necessary to bring about this result. Statements have been made in the Press to the effect that new edicts against the Jews will come into force in the present year. They are, so far as I have been able to ascertain, absolutely without foundation. No new edicts have been issued, and none are in

contemplation. None are necessary. The existing laws are amply sufficient, if properly enforced, to meet the exigencies of the present situation. In the past, Jews have chosen to disobey these laws. Past masters in the art of evasion, they have, up to the present time, found little difficulty in escaping the penalty of disobedience. In the Russians they found a flabby, easy-going people, always accommodating in the matter of bribes. It was the easiest thing in the world for them to corrupt the poorly paid and not over-scrupulous Russian official, and when a Governor or Governor-General chanced to get into monetary difficulties, they knew well how to turn his misfortune to their advantage. So successful have their artifices been that the boundaries of the Pale of Settlement may be said to exist at the present time only on paper. Look at Moscow. In that "city of the throne," there are now over one hundred thousand Jews. Had the laws regulating the sojourn of Jews outside the Pale been observed, that city would not now contain many more than one thousand Jews. Look at St. Petersburg. Thirty years ago one hardly ever came across a Jew in the streets of that capital. Now the city swarms with Jews. As like as not, you have a Jew as your next-door neighbour, a Jew as your neighbour over the way, and a Jew as your neighbour in the tenement over your head. In the theatre, in the street, everywhere the Jew is in evidence. The banks and institutions depend almost solely upon him.

Few of these gentlemen are merchants, and pay their guild-money; few pursue the callings in respect of which they have obtained permission to reside outside the Pale. Only a small proportion have had an education fitting them for the professions. The Jew artisan who practises his art is a rarity. He is not to be found except in the most abject poverty. No sooner does he save a few roubles than he takes either to broking or the liquor trade. He scorns physical exertion if he can live by his wits.

It seems to me, therefore, that Russian Jews have chiefly themselves to blame for their present troubles. Knowing well what the law was, they chose to disregard it. They smart now from the strokes of a rod of their own making. None the less, it is to be hoped that their present chastisement will be made as light as possible, that they will be treated as men, and not as microbes, and that the corrupt officials, who are partly to blame for the present condition of things, will not be allowed to go off scot-free.

ANGLO-RUSSIAN.

SOCIAL LIFE AMONG THE ASSYRIANS AND BABYLONIANS.

BY PROFESSOR SAYCE, LL.D., AUTHOR OF "FRESH LIGHT FROM THE ANCIENT MONUMENTS."

From *The Sunday at Home* (London), December, 1890, January, February, and March, 1891.

III.*—EDUCATION.

THE Babylonians were the Chinese of the ancient world. They were essentially a reading and writing people. In spite of the intricacy of their system of writing with its multitudinous characters, each of which had more than one phonetic value, and might be used to express an idea or word, books were numerous and students were many. The books were for the most part written upon clay with a wooden reed, or metal stylus, for clay was cheap and plentiful and easily impressed with the wedge-shaped lines of which the characters were composed. But besides clay, papyrus and possibly also parchment were employed as writing materials; at all events the papyrus is referred to in the texts, though all vestiges of it have long since disappeared in the damp climate of the valley of the Euphrates.

The use of clay for writing purposes extended, along with Babylonian culture, to the neighbouring populations of the East. In the century before the Exodus recent discoveries have shown that clay libraries existed, and that an active correspondence was carried on by means of clay tablets, in all parts of the ancient Oriental world. The Babylonian language and characters were taught and learned not only in Mesopotamia or Aram, but also in Kappadocia, Syria, Palestine, and even Egypt. Letters on clay in the cuneiform script were sent from Phœnicia and the cities of the Philistines, from Gaza and Ashkelon, from Lachish and Megiddo. If ever the site of Kirjath-Sepher or "Booktown," which was destroyed by Othniel (Judges i. 12, 13), be discovered and excavated, it is possible that we may find a store of records in clay among its ruins. The invasion of Syria by the Hittites and their subsequent wars with the Egyptians, together with the conquest of Canaan by the Israelites, put an end to the early intercourse between Babylonia and the West. The use of the Babylonian language was discontinued among the educated circles of Syria and Palestine; the cuneiform syllabary was supplanted by the simpler Phœnician alphabet; and papyrus or parchment, rather

* Nos. I. and II. are in the December (1890) number.

than clay material. monarch have again reign of was struck a sun-disk imitation time in kiah ca xxv. 1) who kept copying which surprised ing many introduced from J so too legal d of clay with a a sum whole signed

It is compr tablet. allowed thanks the ch nute s on m from t not on ers m but a magni prised Layan been t great

Wh press tablet clever to fa called which or li and t peate this with which work table respo so th descr book

than clay, became the ordinary writing material. But in the later days of the Jewish monarchy the employment of clay seems to have again come into favour. From the reign of Ahaz onwards, Assyrian influence was strong in Judah; Ahaz himself set up a sun-dial in Jerusalem (Is. xxxviii. 8), in imitation of those which had existed from time immemorial in Babylonia, and Hezekiah caused old texts to be edited (Prov. xxv. 1) like the kings of Assyria and Chaldea who kept scribes constantly employed in copying out the ancient literature with which their libraries were filled. It is not surprising, therefore, that the common writing material of Assyria and Chaldea was also introduced into Judah. We may gather from Jer. xxxii. 10, 14, that, as in Assyria, so too in Judah in the age of Jeremiah, legal documents were inscribed on tablets of clay which were then sealed and covered with a clay envelope. On this was written a summary of the deed it contained; the whole document being subsequently consigned to the safe keeping of an earthen jar.

It is astonishing how much matter can be compressed into the compass of a single tablet. The cuneiform system of writing allowed the use of many abbreviations—thanks to its “ideographic” nature—and the characters were frequently of a very minute size. Indeed so minute is the writing on many of the Assyrian (as distinguished from the Babylonian) tablets that it is clear not only that the Assyrian scribes and readers must have been decidedly short-sighted, but also that they must have made use of magnifying glasses. We need not be surprised, therefore, to learn that Sir A. H. Layard discovered a crystal lens, which had been turned on a lathe, upon the site of the great library of Nineveh.

Where it was found impossible to compress a text within the limits of a single tablet, it was continued on a second, a very clever arrangement being adopted in order to facilitate reference. The tablets were called “the first” or “second” of a series which received its name from the first word or line of the work inscribed upon them, and the last line of the first tablet was repeated at the beginning of the second. In this way the librarian and reader were able without loss of time to refer to any tablet which was required in a particular series or work. Of course the scribes who copied the tablets endeavoured to make each tablet correspond with what we should call a chapter, so that the several tablets of a series may be described as the successive chapters of a book.

To learn the cuneiform syllabary was a task of much time and labour. The student was accordingly provided with various means of assistance. The characters of the syllabary were classified and named; they were further arranged according to a certain order which partly depended on the number of wedges or lines of which each was composed. Moreover, what we may term dictionaries were compiled, in which every character not only had assigned to it the different phonetic values it possessed, but also the different ideographic significations with which it had been used, or was thought to have been used, in earlier literature. These ideographic significations resulted from the fact that the cuneiform system of writing had been pictorial and hieroglyphic before it had developed into a syllabary, each character representing an idea or word.

To learn the signs, however, with their multitudinous phonetic values and ideographic significations, was not the whole of the labour which the Babylonian boy had to accomplish. The cuneiform system of writing, along with the culture which had produced it, had been the invention of the non-Semitic Accado-Sumerian race, from whom it had been borrowed by the Semites. In Semitic hands the syllabary underwent further modifications and additions, but it bore upon it to the last the stamp of its alien origin. On this account alone, therefore, the Babylonian student who wished to acquire a knowledge of reading and writing was obliged to learn the extinct language of the older population of the country.

There was, however, another reason which even more imperatively obliged him to study the earlier tongue. A large proportion of the ancient literature, more especially that which related to religious subjects, was written in Accado-Sumerian. Even the law cases of early times, which formed precedents for the law of a later age, were in the same language. In fact Accado-Sumerian stood in much the same relation to the Semitic Babylonians that Latin has stood to the modern inhabitants of Europe. Even words and proper names had been borrowed from it, and just as the etymology and meaning of many of our words can be understood only by a reference to Latin, so the etymology and meaning of such words could be understood only by a reference to Accadian.

Besides learning the syllabary, therefore, the Babylonian boy had to learn the extinct language of Accad and Sumer. For this purpose he was provided with lists of words or vocabularies in which the Accadian word was explained in Semitic Assyrian, with

grammatical paradigms giving the forms of the Accadian verbs and postpositions, with the explanations of difficult phrases, with extracts from ancient books translated into Assyrian, notes being sometimes added upon obscure and important words, as well as with interlinear or parallel translations of long and complete texts. The student was also encouraged to write himself in this literary Latin of Chaldea, and numerous works exist which show by their age, their idioms, and sometimes even their errors, that they must have been the work of Semitic scribes. The Accadian of the subjects of Nebuchadnezzar could be as faulty as monkish or schoolboy's Latin.

But a knowledge of Accadian was not all that was demanded from the Assyrian or Babylonian gentleman if he wished to make his way in the world. It will be remembered that the Rab-shakeh, or "Vizier" of Sennacherib, addressed the Jews at Jerusalem in their own language, and that the ministers of Hezekiah asked him to use "Aramaic" or "Syrian" instead (2 Kings xviii. 26). They thus assumed that he could speak a language which, though unknown to the uneducated "people on the wall," was evidently considered to be included in the course of study of an educated gentleman. Aramaic, in fact, had come to occupy a similar position to that occupied by French in modern diplomacy and society. It was the international language of the statesmen of the day. But, unlike French, it had come to occupy this position from its being the language of trade. Aramaic traders were settled in the towns of Babylonia and carried on business in the midst of Nineveh. Commercial documents exist of the age of Tiglath-pileser III. and his successors, in which an Aramaic docket is attached to the cuneiform text, and weights have been found in Assyria which have upon them both Aramaic and Assyrian inscriptions. The Assyrian and Babylonian merchant was consequently compelled to read, write, and speak Aramaic; and the Assyrian conquests, which had for their chief object to divert the trade of Aram and Phœnicia into Assyrian hands, had made it necessary for the politician to follow the example of the merchant. The Assyrian or Babylonian boy had his Latin and French to learn no less than the English boy of to-day.

The history of the Rab-shakeh of Sennacherib shows that a knowledge of these two languages might be supplemented by the knowledge of a third. In addition to Assyrian and Aramaic, he was also able to speak Hebrew, learned, perhaps, from one of the

exiles from the northern kingdom who had been carried away from Samaria eighteen years before. Assyrian contract-tablets of this age have been found, in which mention is made of persons with Israelitish names who resided at Nineveh. The dragoman, or interpreter, moreover, had long been a recognized institution in the East. As far back as the fifteenth century before our era, the king of Aram Naharaim speaks of the *targumannu*, or "dragoman," whom he sent to Egypt; and, seven centuries later, an Assyrian writer makes mention of a *targumannu* of the country of the Minni. When the ambassadors of Gyges of Lydia first arrived in Nineveh, it is recorded, as an evidence of the distance from which they had come, that there was no one found there to understand what they spoke.

The study of foreign tongues naturally brought with it an inquisitiveness about the languages of other people, as well as a passion for etymology. The latter led the grammarians to invent Accadian etymologies for Semitic words, like the Greek or Latin etymologies invented for Teutonic words in English by the dictionary makers of a former generation. Thus we find *Sabattu* or *Sabbatu*, "the Sabbath," derived from the two Accadian words *sa*, "the heart," and *bat*, "to end," and accordingly explained to mean "a day of rest for the heart." The inquisitiveness about foreign languages produced better results. We owe to it the preservation of the meaning of several words in the ancient languages of Elam, and of the other countries by which Babylonia was surrounded. We have, for instance, a list of words belonging to the language of the Kassites on the eastern side of Babylonia, together with their translation; and even a conqueror like Sargon goes out of his way to tell us that a particular architectural term was of Phœnician origin.

But there were other things besides languages which the young student in the schools of Babylonia and Assyria was called upon to learn. Geography, history, the names and nature of plants, birds, animals, and stones, as well as the elements of law and religion, were all objects of instruction. The British Museum possesses what may be called the historical exercise of some Babylonian lad in the age of Nebuchadnezzar or Cyrus, consisting of a list of the kings belonging to one of the early dynasties, which he had been required to learn by heart. The last ruler of the Babylonian Empire, Nabonidos, the father of Belshazzar, was himself an enthusiastic antiquarian, and the pioneer of archaeological excavation. He

caused ex-
of the old
to discov-
the kings
cribed.
ments of
of the Su-
tory of si-
in West-
thedral.
from the
was, of c-
of little
natural o-
on trees,
ing thin-
must hav-

The
temples,
of educa-
attached
rapher,
of Baby-
universi-
and the
be refer-
medicine
British
was stor-
as late
lonian c-
the Cre-
"for th-
of all l-
books t-
a pious

The
Assur-
of decl-
been fo-
readers
office o-
One of
whom
king.
post, a-
the lib-
sion of

A c-
tants
The c-
of rur-
as the
post.
signat-
most
name

caused excavations to be made on the sites of the older temples of Babylonia, in order to discover the inscriptions and records of the kings to whom their foundation was ascribed. His search for the buried monuments of the founder of the great Temple of the Sun-god at Sippara reads like the history of similar searches made in recent years in Westminster Abbey or Canterbury Cathedral. Natural history, as distinguished from the history of the monumental past, was, of course, in its infancy, and consisted of little else than a descriptive catalogue of natural objects. The work of King Solomon on trees, and "beasts, and fowl, and creeping things, and fishes" (1 Kings iv. 33), must have been of a like character.

The libraries were established in the temples, and the schools, in which the work of education was carried on, were doubtless attached to them. Strabo, the Greek geographer, tells us that Borsippa, the suburb of Babylon, was famous for the schools or universities that had once existed there; and the medical college of Borsippa seems to be referred to in a Babylonian treatise on medicine, fragments of which are now in the British Museum. The library of Borsippa was stored in the great Temple of Bel; and as late as the time of Darius we find a Babylonian copying out a portion of the Epic of the Creation, and depositing it in the library, "for the preservation of his life, and the life of all his house."* To add fresh copies of books to the collection was thus considered a pious act.

The libraries were open to the public. Assur-bani-pal, for instance, is never weary of declaring that the library of Nineveh had been founded and enlarged "for the use of readers," and from a very early epoch the office of librarian was held in high honour. One of the earliest Babylonian librarians of whom we know calls himself the son of the king. It was, without doubt, a well-paid post, and the number of scribes employed in the library required in its holder the possession of administrative abilities.

A considerable proportion of the inhabitants of Babylonia could read and write. The contract tablets are written in a variety of running hands, some of which are as bad as the worst that passes through the modern post. Every legal document required the signatures of a number of witnesses, and most of these were able to write their own names. It was only when they could not do

so that the law was satisfied with a simple "nail-mark" in the clay, the name of the witness being appended to the nail mark by the clerk. In Assyria, however, education was by no means so widely spread. Apart from the upper and professional classes, including the men of business, it was confined to a special body of men—the public scribes. Indeed, it is probable that, before the reign of Tiglath-pileser III. (B.C. 745-727), it was only the scribes, as a general rule, who had learned to read and write. In Assyria, accordingly, we find none of that variety of handwritings which often makes the decipherment of a Babylonian document so difficult. A neat official hand was in use there, which seldom displays any individual peculiarities, and remained practically unchanged for several centuries.

Women, as well as men, enjoyed the advantages of education. This is evident from the Babylonian contract-tablets, in which we find women appearing as well as men as plaintiffs or defendants in suits, as partners in commercial transactions, and as signing, when need arose, their names. There was none of that jealous exclusion of women in ancient Babylonia which characterises the East of to-day, and it is probable that boys and girls pursued their studies at the same schools.

The education of a child must have begun early. The strain put upon the memory by the cumbersome cuneiform syllabary and the Accadian language that lay behind it were so great that the acquisition of them must have commenced at an early age. The fragment of an old Accadian folk-tale, which once formed part of a lesson-book for the nursery, shows, however, that it was probably not before the age of five or six. The story is that of a foundling who was picked up in the streets, and taken "from the mouth of the dogs and ravens," being subsequently adopted by the king as his own son. The child, we are told, was first brought before the *asip*, or "prophet," who marked the soles of his feet with his seal;* he was then handed over to the nurse, to whom the boy's "bread, food, shirt and (other) clothing were assured for three years." "So," the story proceeds, "his rearing went on for him for a time." Had the rest of the tale been preserved, we should doubtless have heard something about his education, and light would thus have been thrown on the school-life of a Babylonian lad.

* As the copyist was the son of "an irrigator," one of the poorest of the free labourers of Babylonia, the fact is a striking illustration of the extent to which education was spread in the country.

* Compare Job xlii. 27: "Thou settest a print upon the soles of my feet."

We already know enough, however, to see that education was by no means backward in the old empires of Western Asia. As in Egypt, so too in Babylonia, if not in Assyria, a knowledge of reading and writing was widely spread, books were multiplied, and there were plenty of readers to study them. So far from being illiterate, the ancient civilized East was almost as full of literary activity as is the world of to-day. The so-called critical judgments that have been passed upon it, begotten of ignorance and prejudice, must be revised in the light of the fuller knowledge which we now possess. The Israelites in Canaan were surrounded by nations who were in the enjoyment of ancient cultures, and abundant stores of books. There is every reason for believing that the Israelites also shared in the culture of their neighbours, and the literary activity it implied. We now know that Egyptians and Babylonians wrote and read, not only in the time of David and Solomon, but ages before; why should not the Hebrews also have done the same? If the historical authority of the Old Testament Scriptures is to be overthrown, it must be by other arguments than the unwarranted assumption that letters were unknown in the epoch which they claim to record.

IV.—MARRIAGE AND DEATH.

It is doubtful how far polygamy was practised among the Assyrians and Babylonians. The rich and powerful, indeed, permitted themselves to indulge in the possession of more than one wife, though even in their case one of the wives ranked before the others, and her children alone, so far as we can gather, were considered legitimate. The bulk of the people, however, as in the modern East, could not have afforded the luxury of several wives. Most of the contract tablets which relate to matrimony, imply that the household acknowledged two heads only, and that the husband was contented with a single wife. Moreover the position held by the woman in the Babylonian community is inconsistent with an extensive system of polygamy. It was rather the nomad Arab tribes on the frontiers of Babylonia than the settled and civilised Babylonians themselves, who considered the possession of several wives to be the privilege of the man.

But while polygamy in the strict sense of the term seems to have been rare, concubinage prevailed as widely as it did among the inhabitants of Palestine. But it was fenced about with stringent penalties which fell with especial force upon the woman.

The Babylonian who made a *mésalliance* received no dowry with his spouse; should he wish to divorce her, however, he had to pay her a considerable fine in money, which served for her maintenance after she had left his house. Any unfaithfulness to him upon her part was punished with death. We hear, for instance, of a certain Nebo-akhi-iddin in the time of Nebuchadnezzar, who married a singing-woman, and in the marriage contract it is laid down that if he should divorce her and marry another, he shall pay her as much as six manehs of silver, or about fifty-four pounds; on the other hand, if she commit adultery, she is to be put to death with "an iron sword."

In ordinary cases the husband received a dowry with his wife. This dowry served not only to provide the wedding *trousseau*, but also to make the wife independent of the husband in the matter of property. In this way she was protected from tyrannical conduct upon his part, as well as from the fear of divorce on insufficient grounds. If a divorce took place, the husband was required to hand over to the wife all the property she had brought with her as dowry, and she then either returned to her father's house or set up an independent establishment of her own.

The dowry usually included furniture and slaves as well as money. The slaves were valued at a certain price and might be given in place of a portion of the money which was originally stipulated to be handed over. In one case, for example, a female slave was accepted in place of two-thirds of a maneh of silver (six pounds) which the father of the bride had agreed to pay. Where the dowry was not immediately forthcoming, security for the payment of it was taken by the bridegroom.

The dowry was paid by the father of the bride, if he were alive. If he were dead, or if the mother of the bride had been divorced and was in the enjoyment of her own property, it was she by whom the dowry was given. In such a case permission to marry the daughter was asked by the suitor from the mother instead of from the father, and the mother accordingly was called upon to contribute the dowry.

If the husband died, and his widow married again, she carried her former dowry with her. In such a case, however, the children of the first marriage received two-thirds of the dowry after the mother's death, and the children of the second marriage only one-third. This was in accordance with the law that in the case of a second marriage the children inherited only one-third of the father's property, the other two-thirds going

to the
her dow
erty, ei
or give
was usu
for pu
It was
as com
Thus,
chadne
the cre
should
or the
Where
and r
bride,
propo
in-law
the p
to pu
betwe
actual
with
ther?
Th
to off
insta
wife
her
turn
the
gave
silve
abo
tha
pay
sen
it v
ber
wif
pro
the
ter
ria
a
N
ho
pe
ne
m
C
b
in
t
a
f
d
a

to the children by the first wife. Besides her dowry, the wife might hold other property, either bequeathed to her by her parents or given by her husband. On her death this was usually reckoned along with the dowry for purposes of division among the heirs. It was also reckoned along with the dowry as constituting her property during life. Thus, in the thirty-fourth year of Nebuchadnezzar, we find a father stipulating that the creditors of the father of his son-in-law should have no claim upon either the dowry or the other property of his daughter. Where the dowry had been promised merely, and not symbolically handed over to the bride, the bridegroom could claim only a proportionate amount of it should his father-in-law have incurred pecuniary losses after the promise had been made. The heirs had to pay the dowry if the father-in-law died between his agreement to give it and the actual marriage, and when the wife died without children it returned to her "father's house."

The bridegroom was not usually required to offer anything, except his hand. In some instances, however, we find him buying his wife like a slave, with a present of money to her parents, and receiving no dowry in return. Thus a certain Dagil-ili, who married the daughter of a lady named Khammá, gave the mother one and a half manehs of silver, and a slave worth half a maneh (or about eighteen pounds in all), and stipulated that if he married a second wife he would pay her daughter one maneh of silver and send her back to her mother's house. Here it would appear that Dagil-ili was marrying beneath him, the consequence being that his wife, as long as she lived with him, had no property of her own, and was somewhat in the position of a slave. It is therefore interesting to learn that even in this case marriage with a second wife brought with it as a matter of course the divorce of the first. Nothing could show more clearly how little hold polygamy had upon the Babylonian people.

Marriage, however, was permitted among near relatives by blood. We hear of a man marrying his niece, and, in the time of Cambyses, of a brother marrying his sister by the same father. Perhaps this was in imitation of a well-known Persian custom.

Marriage was partly a religious and partly a civil function. The contracting parties frequently invoked the gods and signed the contract in the presence of a priest. At the same time it was a contract, and in order to be legally valid it had to be drawn up in

legal form and attested by a number of witnesses. Like all other legal documents it was carefully dated and registered.

The possession of property by the wife brought with it the enjoyment of considerable authority. The wife could act apart from her husband, could enter into partnership, could trade with her money, and conduct law-suits in her own name. Numerous deeds exist which record the sale and purchase of slaves by women, who appear in them as the legal equals of men. In other instances the husband and wife, or brother and sister act together, the property sold or bought being regarded as their joint possession. In the eighth year of Nabonidos, for example, we hear of a brother and sister selling a Persian slave-girl "and her son who is on the breast" for 19 shekels of silver (£2 17s.), and four years later (B.C. 544), of a husband and wife borrowing in common a sum of money on which they promise to pay interest at the usual rate of 20 per cent. Even more interesting is a contract dated in the 2nd year of Nabonidos (B.C. 555) in which a father transfers his property to his daughter, reserving to himself only the use of it during the rest of his life. In return, his daughter undertakes to take care of him and to provide him with the necessities of existence, food and drink, oil and clothing.

Equally interesting is the case of a mother in the 5th year of Cambyses who "brought a document" to the priest of the Sun-god at Sippara and "gave" him, like Hannah, her three sons, that they might "enter the house of the males." She alleged that they had not yet entered it, as she had "lived" and "grown old" with them since they were "little ones" until "they had been counted among grown up men."

The "house of the males," into which the young men were introduced, seems to have been a sort of monastic establishment attached to the great temples of Babylonia. The community was under a head, or superintendent, who received each month a certain amount of food and other provision for the support of himself and his associates. They appear to have been celibates, to have lived together in a kind of college, into which women were forbidden to enter, and to have taken part in the daily services of the temple to which they were attached. The expenses of their maintenance were borne partly by endowments, partly by the tithes and other offerings made to the temple. The institution reminds us of the college in which Daniel and his companions were placed, where they were under a superintendent who

provided them with the food furnished by the king (Dan. i. 3-5, 11).

The naming of a child was an important event to the Babylonians and Assyrians. The name was believed to bring with it good or evil fortune, and to represent the owner of it not only symbolically, but even in a more material sense. To change the name, it was believed, had an important bearing on the course of events. When Sennacherib determined to nominate his favourite younger son for the succession to the throne he changed his name from Esar-haddon to Assur-etil-mukin-abla—"Assur, the lord, is the establisher of (my) son." The child was consequently named immediately after birth, perhaps in the presence of the *asip*, or "prophet," to whom reference is made in the nursery-tale which has been already quoted. As circumcision was also practised in Babylonia, it is possible that the two ceremonies of circumcision and name-giving were performed at the same time.

If the parents were childless, it was not unusual for them to adopt a son or daughter, to whom the property of the family could be handed on. The act of adoption consisted in allowing the hands to be taken by the person who was to be adopted, and thus symbolically receiving him into the family. The ceremony must have come down from prehistoric days, as it served to establish the king as the legitimate ruler of Babylon. Babylon was theoretically under a theocracy, under the divine government of Bel Merodach; and before a claimant to the throne could be recognised as its sovereign, it was necessary that he should clasp the hands of the image of the god, and thereby become the adopted son of the true ruler of the city.

A very curious document has been preserved which indicates the close relation that existed between adoption and the devolution of property. A certain Babylonian, named Bel-katsir, had married a widow, and having no children of his own, wished to adopt his step-son. His father, however, intervened, and "made a will" to the effect that the father's property should descend only to a genuine son of Bel-katsir; if no son of his own were born to him, it was to pass after his death to his brother, and in case of his brother's death to his sister; in no case was it to go to an adopted child. Bel-katsir was compelled to assent to these stipulations.

The document is interesting from several points of view, as it shows that a Babylonian had the same power as ourselves, not only of willing his property as he chose after death, but also of tying it up.

The dead were carried to the grave on biers, and were accompanied by mourners. The cemetery in which they were laid was outside the town, and formed a city in itself. The corpse was placed on the ground, wrapped in mats of reed, and covered with asphalt; it was clothed in the dress and ornaments that had been worn during life—the woman with her earrings in her ears, her spindle-whorl and thread in her hand; the man with his seal and weapons of bronze or stone; the child with his necklace of shells. Over all was laid a thick coating of clay, above which branches of palm, terebinth, and sandalwood were frequently placed; the whole was then set on fire, and the corpse and all about it were reduced to ashes. This at least was the earlier custom; in later times ovens of brick were constructed, in which the corpse was placed in its coffin of clay and reeds, and the cremation was not allowed to be complete. The skeletons of the dead are consequently often found in a fair state of preservation. Offerings were made at the same time that the body was burned: these consisted of dates, calves and sheep, birds and fish, which were consumed along with the corpse.

After the process of burning was over, the remains were either allowed to continue on the spot where the cremation had taken place, or were collected into urns and vases of clay. Of course it was only where the cremation had been complete that the latter mode of burial was possible, and even in such cases a portion only of the ashes was deposited in the urn. Where the cremation had been partial, an aperture was made in the shell of clay with which the body had been covered, the aperture was then closed, and a tomb of bricks built over the whole. A similar brick-tomb was built over the urns containing the ashes of those whose bodies had been completely consumed.

It was believed that the spirits of the dead needed sustenance in their new home, and clay-vases were accordingly placed in the tombs, some of them filled with dates and grain, others with wine and oil; but a more bountiful provision was made in the case of water, which, it was thought, was wholesome to drink only when it was fresh and running. Little rivulets were made by the side of the tombs, through which a constant supply of water could be kept flowing for the spiritual needs of the dead. This represented "the water of life" of which we hear so often in the inscriptions. Pure water was indispensable in all religious ceremonies, and ancient legends recorded that there was a spring of "life" bubbling up beneath the

throne of which was... It was... ran in... the dead...

The N... height... were bur... of the ol... pyres of... thus rose... of crude... village... which w... came th... families...

The... well as... erected... corpses... consisted... served a... individual... his fami... into the... over, th... on whic... posed to... up recor... ceased... with se... memor...

Only... appear... the pre... might b... many p... of one... "burne... gon, of... his own... on wha... there t... buried... Amon i... burial i... alive w... alone.

V.—Th

In th... mentio... "the c... be tran... city."... open eq... even in... city of... with a...

throne of the spirits of the underworld, of which whosoever drank would live for ever. It was of this spring that the water which ran in numberless rills through the cities of the dead was a symbol and outward sign.

The Necropolis was constantly growing in height. Successive generations of the dead were burned one above the other, the tombs of the older serving as a floor for the funeral pyres of the younger generation. The tombs thus rose one upon the other like the houses of crude brick in an Egyptian or Babylonian village. In this way terraces were formed which were surrounded with walls, and became the special burial-places of particular families or districts.

The rich were distinguished in death as well as in life; for them houses were erected, in the chambers of which their corpses were burned and buried. The house consisted of several chambers, and sometimes served as the last resting-place of a single individual, sometimes of other members also of his family; rivulets of water were conducted into the house itself; here were laid, moreover, the various offerings of food and wine on which the soul of the dead man was supposed to live. At times tombstones were set up recounting the name and deeds of the deceased, at other times the tomb was adorned with seated statues of stone, which commemorated the features of the dead.

Only members of the royal family, it would appear, were permitted to be buried within the precincts of the town. Their bodies might be burned and entombed in one of the many palaces of the country. We are told of one king, for instance, that he was "burned" or buried in the Palace of Sargon, of another that he was "burned" in his own palace. The practice throws light on what we read in the Books of Kings: there too we are told that Manasseh "was buried in the garden of his own house," and Amon in the "Garden of Uzza." Private burial in the palaces they had inhabited when alive was a privilege reserved for the kings alone.

V.—THE MARKET, THE MONEY-LENDER AND THE TENANT.

In the tenth chapter of Genesis (ver. 11) mention is made by the side of Nineveh of "the city Rehoboth," which should rather be translated "the public square of the city." It represented, in fact, the great open square on the north eastern side of Nineveh in which the market was held. Every city of Assyria and Babylonia was provided with a similar market-place; here were the

magazines of the corn-merchants, the booths of the vendors of country produce, and the stalls in which cattle, horses, and camels were sold. It thus differed from the *sugu*, or "street"—the "bazaar" of a modern Oriental city—which contained only the regular shops.

Most commodities had to pay a duty, corresponding to the continental *octroi*, before they were allowed to pass the gates of the city and be exposed to sale. It was accordingly to the interest of the purchaser to contract that country goods should be delivered to him within the walls of the city before they were paid for. Thus, in the 18th year of Darius, we hear of a lady named Akhabtu* selling 200 sheep on her property in the country and agreeing to send them into Babylon before receiving for them the stipulated price of 15 manehs of silver (or £135). The purchaser was allowed 10 days within which to pay the money; if he failed to do so, he was to be charged 20 per cent. interest upon the whole amount.

Prices naturally varied, according to the quality or scarcity of what was to be sold. In the 24th year of Nebuchadnezzar, we find one full-grown ox, which was required for the service of the temple of the Sun-god at Sippara, costing 13 shekels, or about £2. In the time of Cambyses 10 shekels (30 shillings) are given for an ox, and 58 shekels (£8 14s.) for 8 "fine sheep"—that is to say about a guinea apiece. The price, however, included the "bakshish" paid to "an Arabian" who looked after them. In the same reign "a mouse-coloured ass, seven years old," was sold for 50 shekels (or £7 10s.), though we also hear of an ass of inferior quality, whose price was only 13 shekels (about £2). It is rather surprising, after this, to learn that a copper libation-bowl and cup together cost as much as 4 manehs, 9 shekels (or £37 7s.); at the same period a good-sized house, with field attached, could be had for only 4½ manehs (£40 10s.), while the rent of another house, with the use of the water in its neighbourhood, amounted to one maneh. In the first year of Cambyses 1 maneh, 7 shekels of silver were paid for a month's work to a seal-cutter, and half a shekel (1s. 6d.) for painting the stucco of a wall. The work alone seems to have been paid for, the materials being furnished to the workmen, as is still the custom in the East. This at all events was the case as regards metal-work; thus, in one instance, 3 manehs of iron were handed over to an "ironsmith" to be made into

* A feminine form of a masculine name corresponding to the Hebrew Ahab.

rods for bows. Three manehs of iron, it may be added, were considered sufficient for the manufacture of 6 swords, 2 door-rings, and 2 bolts.

In the 14th year of Nabonidos (B.C. 542) a contract was made by a builder which included 2 shekels (or 6s.) for 200 bundles of reeds for constructing a bridge across a canal, 1 shekel for 100 bundles of reeds for torches, 50 shekels (£7 10s.) for 500 loads of bitumen for building a tower, 55 shekels for 8000 loads of brick, and 1 shekel for a piece of wood for the handle of an axe. In the same year skins for covering a boat or coracle cost 1 maneh (£9), while in the previous year 18 sheep were sold for 35 shekels (not quite 6 shillings each), and 12 shekels derived from the rent of a house were expended upon digging a trench or canal. In the 4th year of Nabonidos one maneh was demanded for an ass; and in the following year 1 maneh, 7 shekels were paid for an ox, and 6 shekels (or 18 shillings) for a sheep.

The price of wine varied according to its quality. Thus, at one and the same time, 2 "large" casks of new wine were purchased for 11 shekels, and 5 other casks for 10 shekels. Wine was chiefly imported from Armenia and Syria, the wines of the Lebanon being especially prized. Nebuchadnezzar has left us a list of several of the best, among which we find the wine of Helbon, mentioned by Ezekiel (xxvii. 18).

Clothes were comparatively inexpensive. In the time of Nebuchadnezzar, for example, a "mountain-cloak" cost 4½ shekels (13s. 6d.), though doubtless this particular article of dress was made of cheap materials. Half a maneh of silver, together with a *gur* of corn from the royal granary, were given in the 17th year of Nabonidos to five men for work performed in the city of Ruzabu, in the presence of the superintendent of the clothing-department, from which we may infer that they were working tailors. Wages, however, were low, partly in consequence of the employment of slave-labour. Even a porter of the royal granary received only half a shekel a month by way of pay.

On the other hand grain was correspondingly cheap. In the reign of Cambyses, 2 artabs (or about 100 quarts) of corn cost 6½ shekels, and as a quart of corn was considered in ancient Greece a sufficient daily allowance for a man, we may calculate that the Babylonian could manage to live on 2½d. a day. Under Nebuchadnezzar 12 *qas*, or the third part of an artab, of sesame were sold for half a shekel—that is to say the quart of sesame cost a little over a penny. Similarly in the 12th year of Nabonidos one

maneh (or £9) was paid for 6 *gurs* of sesame, and as the *gur* contained 5 artabs, the quart of sesame would have been a little less than 1½d. In the 7th year of Nebuchadnezzar one shekel only had been given for 1½ artabs of dates, or about a halfpenny a quart; while in the 38th year of the same reign we find the quart valued at only ½ of a penny.

Prices, however, were frequently calculated in grain and dates—that great staple of Babylonia—and payments accordingly made in kind instead of in coin. The tithes, for instance, were always paid to the priests in kind, as among the Jews. In the first year of Cambyses we are told that the price of an ox was 150 *gur*, 114 *qas* of dates, the *gur* containing three homers. It was in dates, again, that the wages of the gardeners were paid by the priests attached to the temples of Babylon. In the 19th year of Darius 120 *gur* of dates were sold for 1 maneh, 35 shekels of silver. At this time, therefore, the quart of dates was worth about the tenth part of a penny.

Fish, both from the sea and from fresh water, were a common article of food, and must have been cheap and plentiful. We find them included among the offerings made to the gods. As at Athens, salted fish were largely eaten.

The streets, where troops of dogs acted as scavengers, as they still do in the East, were lined with shops; the business was sometimes conducted by a woman, and often consisted of a joint partnership. Deeds relating to the formation or dissolution of a partnership are by no means rare. Generally it was customary for each of the persons who entered into partnership to contribute an equal share to the business, the profits on the business both "in town and country" being afterwards divided equally between them. When one of the parties contributed more than the other, provision was made for a proportionate distribution of gains and losses. The following deed may be taken as an illustration of the way in which a partnership could be dissolved: "A partnership was entered into between Nebo-yukin-abla and his son Nebo-bel-sunu on the one side, and Musezib-Bel on the other, which lasted from the 18th year of Nabopolassar, king of Babylon, to the 18th year of Nebuchadnezzar. The contract was brought up before the judge of the judges. Fifty shekels of silver had been adjudged to Nebo-bel-sunu and his father, Nebo-yukin-abla. No further agreement or partnership exists between the two parties. They have ended their contract with one another. All former obliga-

tions in
follow
date, "18th
lon."

A bu
in the
ment
Nerigh
shows
"As I
of Illi
els, B
share
place
Nebo-
and I
dhem
is a c
Solom
muh.
come
there
high

Oth
migh
nersh
that
barre
in th
and
bazar
accu
cont

Ev
not
then
Nabo
cont
acted
hous
One
"

woo
the
tsab
zar,
of t
to M
of
nam
hou
erty
try
son
cei
pay
int
nes
up
dat

tions in their names are rescinded." Then follow the names of the witnesses, and the date, "The 8th day of Sebat (January), the 18th year of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon."

A business could be carried on by the wife in the absence of her husband. A document belonging to the second year of Neriglissor or Nergalsharezer (B.C. 559) shows this very clearly. Here we read: "As long as Pani-Nebo-dhemi, the brother of Ili-qanua, does not return from his travels, Burasu, the wife of Ili-qanua, shall share in the business of Ili-qanua, in the place of Pani-Nebo-dhemi. When Pani-Nebo-dhemi returns, she shall leave Ili-qanua and hand over the share to Pani-Nebo-dhemi." Among the witnesses to this deed is a certain "minister of the king" called Solomon (Salammanu), the son of Baaltam-muh. The name indicates that he had come from Palestine or Syria, and it is therefore interesting to find him holding high office at the Babylonian court.

Other goods besides money and houses might serve as the subject of a deed of partnership. Thus, in one instance, we are told that "200 barrels full of good beer, 20 empty barrels, 10 cups and saucers, 90 *gur* of dates in the storehouse, 15 *gur* of chickpease (?) and 14 sheep, besides the profits from the bazaar and whatever property Bel-sunu has accumulated, shall be shared between" the contracting parties.

Even the members of the royal family did not consider commercial dealings beneath them. The name of Belshazzar, the son of Nabonidos, more than once appears in the contract-tablets, though it is true that he acted indirectly through the steward of his house, as well as through his secretaries. One of these tablets reads as follows:—

"Twenty manehs of silver, the price of wool, the property of Belshazzar the son of the king, which, by the hands of Nebo-tsabit, the steward of the house of Belshazzar, the son of the king, and the secretaries of the son of the king, has been handed over to Nadin-Merodach, the son of Basa the son of Nur-Sin, in the month Adar, the silver, namely 20 manehs, he shall give. The house of . . . a Persian, and all the property of Nadin-Merodach in town and country shall be the security of Belshazzar, the son of the king, until Belshazzar shall receive in full the money. The debtor shall pay the whole sum of money as well as the interest upon it." The names of six witnesses, including that of the priest who drew up the deed, are then added, as well as the date: "at Babylon, the 20th day of the

month (Adar), the 11th year of Nabonidos king of (Babylon)."

It will be seen from this document that Belshazzar, whose name has been made familiar to us through the Book of Daniel, was not averse to acting as a wood merchant, when money could be made thereby.

It will also be seen that in his trading transactions the heir to the throne had to conform to the requirements of the law like the meanest of his father's subjects. Witnesses and a properly attested deed were necessary to protect the prince against fraud. The fact illustrates the commercial and legal instincts of the Babylonians, as well as the restrictions that were placed by them on the exercise of the royal authority.

Money-lending was naturally carried on upon an extensive scale. Under Nebuchadnezzar and his successors the usual rate of interest was 20 per cent., the interest being paid each month, though at times we find it was reduced to 13½ per cent., and in a time of famine even remitted altogether by a patriotic money-lender. In concluding a bargain it was ordinarily stipulated that if the money were not paid by a specified date, interest upon it at the customary rate should run on until it was paid in full.

In Nineveh in the age of Tiglath-pileser III. and Sennacherib the rate of interest seems to have been different from that which afterwards prevailed in Babylonia. Thus we are told of 6 manehs, 10 shekels of silver being lent out at interest which was to be at "a fourfold" rate, and of 2 talents of "the best bronze" being given on a loan, the interest on them to be "three times" their value. In Assyria, besides the national standard of "the royal maneh," the Hittite standard of "the maneh of Carchemish" was in use, according to which commercial transactions could be regulated.

The metal, whether gold, silver or bronze, was measured out by weight, and it was only in the later Babylonian period that this somewhat cumbersome way of conducting business was replaced by symbols or coins. On these was marked the weight represented by each.

The extensive system of credit implied by the Babylonian contract-tablets proves what a trading centre Babylonia had become. Goods were imported into it from all parts of the known world, and in return corn, dates, and palm-wine were exported abroad. A good deal of the business, however, carried on by the money-lenders was due to the necessity the poorer classes were frequently under of paying their taxes in coin. Many

of these taxes, it is true, could be paid in kind, but it is probable that the capitation-tax which was levied on the whole community had to be paid in cash. The tribute paid by the subject-states, as well as the contributions to the royal treasury due each year from the cities and districts of the kingdom, had also to be made in coin. These contributions were levied both in Assyria and in Babylonia. In the time of Sennacherib, for example, the contribution due from Nineveh was assessed at 30 talents; that from Calah at five. At the same time, Carchemish, the ancient Hittite capital, had to pay 100 talents.

In Babylonia, if not in Assyria, even the brick-yards were taxed, the privilege of making bricks—the universal material of the buildings of the country—requiring the permission of the government. It is also probable that the owners of property, if not the tenants, were obliged to contribute a fixed amount of grain each year to the royal *sutummu*, or “granary,” which existed in each of the large towns, and out of which grants of food were made to the religious and civil functionaries.

Whether houses were taxed is not known. At all events nothing is said upon the subject in the numerous deeds that relate to them. These deeds, however, throw a flood of light on the laws which regulated their sale or letting. The exact limitations of the property to be let or sold and the condition of the house were minutely described, as well as the length of time for which it was to be leased, and the rent to be paid by the tenant. The tenant usually agreed to return the property in the state in which he found it, keeping the fabric in repair at his own expense and carefully cultivating the garden. Any transgression of the terms of the lease was punished with a severe fine.

The value of the house depended on its size, position, and character. In the reign of Cambyses we hear of a house being let for three years at 16 shekels a year, while, at the same time, another house was rented for a year at only 5 shekels. In the latter case it is stipulated that half the rent shall be paid at the beginning and the other half in the middle of the year, and that the tenant shall repair all damages to the walls of the building. Any transgression of the terms of the contract was to be punished with a fine of 10 shekels, or double the amount of the rent, which was to be paid to the wife of the owner of the house. It is therefore probable that the husband was dead and

that the property had passed into the hands of his widow.

At the beginning of the same reign we find 4½ manehs of silver (or £40 10s.) given for a field and house, and another house sold in the joint name of a man and his wife for 2 manehs (or £18). At the same time a woman pays only two shekels (or 6s.) for the house “in which she lives.” It must, therefore, have been a mere hovel. It is curious to learn how many of the houses which were sold or let in Babylonia belonged to women; some of them had doubtless formed part of their dowries, but others must have been left to them by their husbands after death. One of them, which belonged to a lady named Buhiti, is described as being situated in “the Broad Street” of Babylon, “the passage of the gods and the king.” In the deed of sale of this house it is stipulated that if the buyer asserts that “the house has not been given up” to him, the owner shall receive twelve times the amount of its purchase-money.

The same formalities which accompanied the sale or letting of a house in Babylonia were observed in Assyria. Here, for example, is the translation of a deed of sale, which is dated in the year 692 B.C., or eleven years before the death of Sennacherib: “The nail-mark of Sarludari, the nail-mark of Atar-suru (and), the nail-mark of the woman Amat-Suhla, the wife of Bel-dur, a captain (?), the owner of the house which is sold.” [Then follow four nail-marks.] “The house, well-constructed, with its beams and doors, situated in the city of Nineveh, adjoining the houses of Mannu-ki-akhi and Ilu-ittiya, and the Street of the Messenger, has been sold, and Tsil-Assur, the superintendent, an Egyptian, has bought it for one maneh of silver, according to the royal standard, in the presence of Sar-ludari, Atar-suru, and Amat-suhla, the wife of its owner. The full sum has been paid, the house in question has been bought: there shall be no retraction or annulment of the contract. Whosoever hereafter, among the sellers, shall claim an annulment of the contract from Tsil Assur shall be fined 10 manehs of silver. The witnesses are: Susanqu, the son-in-law of the king, Kharmaza, the captain (?), Rasuh, the sailor, Nebo-dur-zikari, the spy, Kharmaza, the naval captain, Sin-sharezer, and Zedekiah. Dated the 16th day of the month Sivan (May), in the eponymy of Zazâ, the governor of Arpad. The contract has been signed in the presence of Samas-yukin-akhi, Latturu, and Nebo-sum-utsur.”

In Ba
widely-s
have at
deed in
the wit
an Israe
erty is d
high po
fore ap
able to
State.

Hous
bought
of an ag
careful-
been b
buyer,
his ow
purcha
agreed
ited t
month
specifi
came
tage w
purch
propet
propet
traint

Th
of pro
inter
Hana
The
ver f
weigh
He t
seale
closin
whic
tent
thei
cont
seale
to v
“in
rese
Bab
Suc
safe
ticu
late
wh
sale
it v
ere
and
lon
the

In Babylonia, where education was more widely-spread, the contracting-parties would have attached their names and seals to the deed instead of their nail-marks. One of the witnesses, Zedekiah, seems to have been an Israelite, while the purchaser of the property is described as an Egyptian, who held a high position in Nineveh. It would therefore appear that foreigners in Assyria were able to hold property as well as offices of State.

House-property, like slaves, could be bought and sold through the intervention of an agent. In this case the purchaser was careful to state that the property which had been bought did not belong to its nominal buyer, and also to keep the deed of sale in his own hands. When the money for the purchase was advanced by the agent it was agreed that it should be repaid within a limited time—in one instance within two months; failing its repayment within the specified period, what had been bought became the property of the agent. Advantage was occasionally taken of this system of purchase to buy a piece of land or other property in the name of the wife, whose property was usually protected from dis-traint for her husband's debts.

The legal formalities attendant on the sale of property in Assyria and Babylonia are an interesting commentary on the purchase of Hanameel's field by Jeremiah (Jer. xxxii.). The prophet agreed to pay 17 shekels of silver for it, and the money was accordingly weighed out in the presence of witnesses. He then added his signature to the deed, and sealed it afterwards, as it would appear, enclosing the whole in a clay envelope, on which was inscribed a statement of its contents. The witnesses had previously attached their names to the document. The deed, containing both the document that had been sealed, and the document that was exposed to view (v. 14), was subsequently deposited "in an earthen vessel," which must have resembled the earthen jars in which the Babylonian contract-tablets are found. Such jars served the purpose of a modern safe, and were each appropriated to a particular set of documents, or to those that related to a particular family. Who can say whether we shall not yet recover the deed of sale signed by Jeremiah, and the jar to which it was entrusted, as we have already recovered the similar deeds that were drawn up and signed by his contemporaries in Babylonia? Stranger events have happened in the romance of modern excavation.

VI.—SLAVERY AND THE AGRICULTURAL LABOURER.

In Assyria and Babylonia as throughout the ancient world, slavery formed one of the most important elements of social life. The distinction between the freeman and the slave was one which it is difficult for us of Western Europe to realise. The gulf between the two was profound while it lasted, but it was not necessarily permanent. The slave might always look forward to the recovery of his freedom. Nay more, it was possible for him to rise to high offices of state and become the political ruler of his former master. Moreover, between the slave and his owner there was none of that antagonism of race or colour which has characterised slavery in the America of our own days. They belonged to the same or an allied race, sometimes to the same population: their ideas, beliefs, religion, even education were not very dissimilar. The slave was, in fact, a member of the family, like the child, with this difference, however, that when the child grew up he necessarily became his own master, whereas the slave remained subject to another until he recovered his freedom.

From an early period the slave had been an object of care to the legislature. In Accadian law it had already been laid down that the life of the slave was not absolutely at his master's disposal. If the master, it is enacted, kill, beat, maim, or destroy the health of the slave, the hand which has so offended, shall pay each day half a measure of corn. This was doubtless to be given to the slave for his maintenance if he still lived; we are not informed as to who should receive it in case of his death. We hear, however, of a master receiving a maneh of silver as compensation for the murder of his slave by another person.

In later times a slave could even appear as party to a suit. In the 10th year of Nabonidos (B.C. 546) a slave called Nergal-ritsua brought the following case before the judges. He had been sent by his master with 480 *gur* of fruit from the fields to the ships of a certain Baalnathan, who had been commissioned to transport it to Babylon. A portion of the fruit was stolen on the way to that city, and Baalnathan, whose name indicates his Phœnician origin, undertook to replace it. Instead of doing so he absconded, and had but just been caught again. Five judges deliberated on the matter and gave judgment in favour of the slave and his master.

The slave could also, under certain circum-

stances, engage in business upon his own account, and so lay by a sum of money by means of which he might eventually purchase his freedom. He could also hire himself to another than his own master. In the 28th year of Nebuchadnezzar (B.C. 577), for example, a deed was drawn up before several witnesses enjoining that "on the day when Nebo nadin-akhi the slave of Ina-Esuggil-suma-epus enters into the service of Ubar he shall give his wages" to his former master. In this case, however, it may be questioned whether the deed does not mean, not that the wages the slave received on first entering the service of another were to be given to his original owner, but that he was as it were lent by his master to a second employer, the wages he received from the latter being his master's property during the whole period of his absence from the latter's house.

The slave could become a freeman, either by manumission, or by purchase, or by proving that he had been unlawfully enslaved. He might also recover his liberty by being adopted as a son into the family of a citizen. His master might also lose him by his being taken into the household of the king as "a royal servant," or, in the case of a female slave, as a concubine. As the "royal servant" enjoyed a considerable amount of civil power, the position was highly prized. Any slave, it would appear, was liable to be impressed into the royal service, just as he was liable to be adopted into a family. Accordingly, in buying a slave, it was usual for the seller to agree to bear all the risk and trouble which such claims would cause. Here, for instance, is a deed of sale which was registered at Borsippa before three witnesses in the 29th year of Nebuchadnezzar: "The woman Bahu-edirat and Itti-Nebo-panya, the son of the Woman Ubartu, the slaves of the lady Gusummu, the daughter of the lady Sabullatu, have been sold on account to Merodach-edir-napisti, the son of Mandidi, for half a maneh of silver in shekel pieces; Gusummu undertakes all responsibility, whether as plaintiff or defendant in regard to claims for freedom or for royal service on the part of the slaves."

A curious case which was decided at Babylon on the 17th of Marchesvan, in the 7th year of Nabonidos (B.C. 549), illustrates the attempts sometimes made by a slave to recover his freedom, and at the same time the care taken by the law that justice should be done to all parties, freemen and slaves alike. A certain Barachiel, whose name seems to show that he was of Jewish descent, had been sold in the 35th year of Nebuchadnezzar by Akhi-nuri, the son of Nebo-nadin-

akhi, to a lady named Gaga. Gaga had given him to her daughter Nubta ('the Bee') as part of the latter's dowry, and Nubta had subsequently "alienated him by a sealed contract in exchange for a house and slaves." Barachiel then asserted that he was a freeman, born of a noble Babylonian family and unlawfully detained in servitude. The case accordingly came before the court, consisting of "the high priest, the nobles and the judges." Akhi-nuri did not appear, and it was eventually decided by the confession of Barachiel and a true account of his former life, that his claim was a fiction.

"Twice have I run away from the house of my master," he said, "but many people were present and I was seen. I was afraid, and said (accordingly) that I was the son of a noble ancestor. My citizenship has no existence; I was the slave of ransom of Gaga. I am a slave. Go now (pronounce sentence) upon me." The court consequently "restored him to his condition of slavery."*

One of the proofs of his citizenship brought forward by Barachiel had been that he had joined the hands of the brother and daughter of Akhi-nuri in matrimony. It would therefore appear that this was a ceremony which could be performed only by a freeman, and that Akhi-nuri should have allowed Barachiel to perform it was a tacit admission that he was no longer a slave. In order to prevent similar attempts to escape on the part of the slaves it was usual for the owners to brand or tattoo them, generally with their master's names.

The husband and wife must often have been separated when a slave was sold. Thus in the time of Nebuchadnezzar we hear of a woman Sakinna and her daughter a little girl of three years of age being sold for 35 shekels of silver, or five guineas, and in the 8th year of the same reign a brother and sister sold two Persians, a slave-woman and "her son who was upon her breast" for 19 shekels. The ancient Accadian law ordered that if children had been born to slaves whom their former owner had sold while still keeping a claim upon them, he should in buying them back take the children as well at the rate of one and a half shekel each. At times, however, husband and wife were sold together. In one case the price received for a slave and his wife was 55 shekels, or £8 5s., part of which was paid on the spot, part on account; and in the reign of Cambyses two slave who had been sold along with their wives, but afterwards reclaimed

* See Dr. Oppert's translation and remarks upon the case in the new series of "Records of the Past," I., pp. 154-162.

by the s
without
parents
pecially
that de
way. I
denied
and sold

The
any oth
a portio
seen; h
paymen
master
hire hi
way go
price de
and ap
to a ve

In p
monly
his he
had no
in the
fact, d
against
was no
bargain
to be
which
early
which
follow
yusez
follow
bonid

Ab, t
of Ba
sheke
Sula,
tende
not p
tened
mone
akhi
had n
had
judg
Edil
judg
ceive
and
(by
be i
Neb
exar
pied
T
sim
Bab
date

by the seller, were not given back to him without their wives. We even find that parents sold their children into slavery, especially if they were girls, and it is possible that debtors might be treated in the same way. By the early Accadian law, a son who denied his father was ordered to be shorn and sold as a slave.

The slave was regarded as a chattel like any other kind of property. He could form a portion of a daughter's dowry as we have seen; he could serve as the security for the payment of a debt; he could be lent by his master to a friend; and the master could hire him out, the wages he received in this way going into his master's pocket. His price depended on his strength, abilities, age and appearance, and varied from a very high to a very low figure.

In parting with a slave the seller commonly stated that he did so "in the joy of his heart," which seems to mean that he had not been driven to the act by any faults in the slave himself. The expression, in fact, denoted that he had nothing to say against the slave's character, and that he was not deceiving the purchaser into a bad bargain. That the purchaser of a slave had to be on his guard is evident from a case which was brought before the judges in the early part of the reign of Nabonidos, and which has been translated by Dr. Oppert as follows: "Beli-litu, the daughter of Bel-yusezib, the wine-merchant (?), gave the following evidence before the judges of Nabonidos, king of Babylon: 'In the month Ab, the first year of Nergal-sharezer, king of Babylon, I sold my slave Bazuzu for 35 shekels of silver to Nebo-akhi-iddin, son of Sula, the descendant of Egibi; he has pretended that I owed him a debt, and so has not paid me the money.' The judges listened, caused Nebo-akhi-iddin to be summoned and to appear before them. Nebo-akhi-iddin produced the contracts which he had made with Beli-litu; he proved that she had received the money and convinced the judges. And Ziriya, Nebo-sum-lisir and Edillu gave (further) evidence before the judges that Beli-litu their mother had received the silver. The judges deliberated and condemned Beli-litu to (pay) 55 shekels (by way of fine), the highest fine that could be inflicted on her, and they gave it to Nebo-akhi-iddin." The text affords a good example of the independent position occupied by the Babylonian free-women.

The regulations relating to slavery were similar in Assyria to what they were in Babylonia. A deed of sale of three slaves, dated B.C. 709 in the reign of Sargon, may

be quoted, as it is interesting on account of the names of three of the witnesses, Pekah (*Paqakha*), Nebabiah (*Nadbiyâhu*), and Ben-didiri, all of whom were evidently Israelites. Pekah and Nebabiah are described as holding offices of state. The slaves were sold by a certain Dagon-melech for 3 manehs of silver, "according to the standard of the maneh of Carchemish," and it is stipulated that if the seller or any of his sons, grandsons or relatives shall maintain that the price was not paid, or that the contract had been violated by the purchaser, the latter was to receive ten times the amount of the price he had paid, while the offender was further punished with a fine of one maneh of gold (or £140) to the goddess Istar of Arbela.

Another deed of sale of somewhat later date is equally interesting on account of its contents. It relates to the sale of his daughter by a certain Nebo-rikhti-utsur for 16 shekels of silver (£2 8s.) to a lady who wished to marry the girl to her own son and heir. The contract could be annulled by the father or relations of the girl upon the payment of 10 silver manehs, that is to say £90. We learn from it that the women of Assyria had the same power of transacting business as the women of Babylonia, and that in both countries parents were able to sell their children into slavery. But it is new to find that a wife could be bought in this way.

There were few Babylonians so poor as not to be able to keep a slave; even one slave might possess another slave of his own. A deed exists, dated in the 27th year of Nebuchadnezzar, which records the sale of a female slave for two-thirds of a silver shekel (2 shillings) to "the slave of Nebo-baladh-yulid, the porter" of the temple of the Sun-god at Sippara. The smallness of the price indicates the poverty of the purchaser, and as it is stated that the money was to be paid on account, it would seem that even the small sum required was not forthcoming at the moment. The deed was attested by several witnesses, the first of whom was a slave. Nothing can show more clearly what a definite legal position a slave must have occupied in Babylonia.

The large amount of slave-labour necessarily caused wages to be low; it also introduced into the country a numerous population, which might be dangerous in times of war or civil discontent. We know from the history of Barachiel that the slave was not always contented with his lot in life, and sometimes seized an opportunity of running away. On the other hand, the slaves pos-

sessed neither cohesion nor discipline; they had no leaders, they belonged to different nationalities, and were without arms. Moreover they were divided into different classes. There were the royal slaves, among whom the eunuchs may be included, who occupied posts of importance and power, and regarded themselves as the superiors of many of the poorer freemen. Then, secondly, there were the temple-slaves, devoted to the service of the gods, like the Nethinim in the temple of Jerusalem, whose persons were consecrated and sacrosanct. Thirdly, there were the household slaves, a large number of whom were virtually members of the family in which they lived, and who might look forward to being adopted by their masters. Those who belonged to rich households were probably well-fed, well-clothed, and little worked. Lastly, there were the slaves who laboured in the country, whose lot was doubtless harder than that of the slaves in the towns; but who, nevertheless, enjoyed a certain amount of freedom, which country life necessarily brought with it.

It is probable, however, that the number of slaves employed in the country was vastly exceeded by that of the slaves who lived in the towns. The Babylonians were an agricultural people, and the greater part of the work carried on in the country was conducted by free men. They were irrigators, gardeners, shepherds, and goatherds, tenders of cattle, and agricultural labourers. The gardener and shepherd held a high place in popular esteem. Tradition alleged that Sargon I., the founder of the first Semitic Empire, and of the great library of Accad, had been a gardener before he was called to the throne through the love of the goddess Istar, and it further related that when, like Moses, he had in his infancy been consigned to an ark of bulrushes and bitumen, and cast upon the Euphrates, he was discovered and brought up as a son by Akki, the irrigator. Tammuz himself, the young and beautiful Sun-god, had been a shepherd according to the old belief, and the Bedouin Arab, or nomad Aramean, who usually looked after the flocks of the wealthy Babylonian in the later days of the kingdom, was not only a freeman, but respected on account of his strength, his courage, and his connections.

We hear a good deal about the life of the Babylonian farmer or labourer from the fragments of an old Accadian work on agriculture, extracts from which were provided with translations into Assyrian, and used as a reading-book by students who were learn-

ing Accadian.* Here we are told that the agriculturist must begin his work in the sixth month of the year when he agrees with his landlord about his rent, pays his taxes to the government, hedges in his fields, brings together his flocks, and works from dawn to dusk.

The sixth month, as Mr. Bertin points out, was Elul, hence we may conclude that the agricultural year originally began with Tisri, or September, the 7th month, and not with Nisan, or March. This throws light on the fact that Tisri was the first month of the Jewish civil year, and that the Feast of Trumpets was celebrated on its first day.

The tenure of a farm was of various kinds. In some cases the property belonged half to the landlord, and half to the tenant, when the tenant bound himself to plough, sow, manure, and water, and to hand over the produce of the landlord's half to the agent appointed by the latter. In other cases the whole farm, with its produce, was shared equally between the landlord and the tenant; the tenant giving his labour, and the landlord in return providing him with carts, oxen, and other necessities. But there were several modifications of this system of partnership. The landlord might stipulate that the farmer should receive only a third, a fourth, a fifth, or even a tenth of the produce, the rest being appropriated by himself. In addition to this, it would seem, the tenant was required to pay a fixed rent, which consisted of two-thirds of the dates gathered from the trees on the farm, or their equivalent in money. The dates had to be handed over to the landlord on the last day of the month Marchesvan, or October. The landlord reserved to himself the right of dismissing his tenant, who was required to keep the farm in order, repair the walls and fences, plant date-palms, and water the young trees. When taking a new farm, moreover, on which there was no house, he was required to build the house in the middle of the property, paying the wages of the workmen when the work was finished. If the house was badly or improperly built, it is stated that he might be fined as much as ten shekels.

It must be remembered that all these are regulations of a very early period, and that as time progressed, the tenure of land, and the laws and customs relating to it necessarily became much more complicated. Still the general outlines of the system remained unaltered; the farmer paid his rent in kind

* The fragments have been translated by Mr. Bertin for the new series of "Records of the Past," iii., pp. 91-101.

rather than
sembled
system of
tive.

Some
us with
guiled th
lated in
reading-
language
dressed

Or ap
the pea

Like
Babylo
Like
opposit
we it
know
a man
life."
have c
dom o

THE
O

From

MY
born
walk,
ciatio
some
day.
my f
dahli
a gar
an ac
with
occu
like
it m
with
the
the
sorb
Und
exte

rather than in money, and the tenure resembled that of the French *métayer*. The system of farming was essentially co-operative.

Some of the songs have been preserved to us with which the Accadian peasants beguiled their labour. They, too, were translated into Assyrian, and formed part of a reading-book used by students of the ancient language. This is how the cattle were addressed as they ploughed the field :

A heifer am I ;
To the cow am I yoked :
The plough-handle is strong—
A shaft of palm—
Lift it up, lift it up !

Or again, while threshing was going on, the peasant would sing :

My knees are marching,
My feet are not resting ;
Working not thyself,
Drive me in company !

Like all agricultural populations the Babylonian peasantry delighted in proverbs : " Like an oven which is old be firm against opposition." " The corn is high, how know we it is ripe ? The corn is cut down, how know we it is good ? " " The fruit of death a man may eat, and yet find it the fruit of life." Such are some of the sayings which have come down to us from the popular wisdom of ancient Chaldaea.

THE EARLY RELIGIOUS HISTORY OF CHARLES BRADLAUGH.

BY W. R. BRADLAUGH.

From *The British Weekly* (London), February 19, 1891.

MY brother, named after my father, was born on September 26th, 1833, at Bacchus-walk, Hoxton, the environments and associations of this spot being very different some sixty years ago to what they are to-day. When my brother was very young, my father, who was quite a connoisseur of dahlias, removed to a cottage surrounded by a garden measuring about three-quarters of an acre in extent. This cottage was situated within five minutes' walk of the site now occupied by Columbia, and therefore to one like my father, passionately fond of flowers, it must have proved a very paradise, for within the half-hour he could be away from the confinement of the office and the din of the city, breathing fresh air and wholly absorbed in the care and culture of his pets. Under the ruthless march of metropolitan extension, the garden had to give place to

bricks and mortar, and as a consequence the family were compelled to remove ; this time to Warner-place, Hackney-road.

In most reports it has been asserted that my brother's " early education was of the scantiest character." If by this statement it is intended to show that he did not, as a youth, receive a classical education, then it is correct, not otherwise ; for, judged by present-day standards, the education my father gave my brother would be considered a good, sound English one ; and while it would ill become a Christian and a brother to say or write one word calculated to reflect on the memory of one over whose grave the grass has not yet had time to grow, there is also a debt due to the memory of a dead father, and therefore the best tribute of respect that I can pay to the memory of both is to speak the truth.

It is an admitted fact that my brother was a most precocious child, and if it were stated that the late Charles Bradlaugh had no real boyhood, it could scarcely be looked upon as an exaggerated description, as infancy in his case appeared to be followed by premature manhood. That my brother received his elementary education at Abbey-street is perfectly true, but afterwards he attended Mr. Marshall's Academy in the Hackney-road, and as I know of one Nonconformist minister and also a lady of literary tastes in the neighbourhood of Wellington, Somerset, both of whom received their education from the same source, it is not at all difficult, even after this lapse of time, to ascertain what was the nature and character of the book-learning imparted.

It has been further stated that my brother " at the early age of twelve, entered on the struggle of life as an errand-boy." Well, as regards that, the thing remains the same, though it goes by a more euphonious name at the present time—a junior clerk ; and many of our great naval commanders, merchant princes, and others who saw the first light of day some sixty years ago faced the stern battle of life at precisely the same age, because it was the custom at that time to do so. Call my brother's first position, however, by what name you will, it could scarcely have been a mere menial one, when it was under the supervision of my father, who was in supreme command. Certain it is that at the present day many a gentleman's son would consider it an honour to be able to place foot in an office of like standing and under like circumstances as a first start in life. After two or three years' experience of office under the eye and training of my father, my brother became cashier to

Messrs. Green, Son & Jones, the well-known coal merchants, City-road Bridge.

In writing an unbiassed account of the early days of the late Charles Bradlaugh, the chief difficulty that one encounters is the fact that few, if any of his biographers have given either names, dates, or places. It is important to note this, because if it is shown that there was no considerable lapse of time between my brother leaving home and entering on the duties of orderly-room clerk, then it stands to reason that the education that fitted him for that post must have been what he received at his father's hands.

While a teacher in the Sunday-school in connection with St. Peter's Church, the Chartist movement rapidly developed, and assumed formidable proportions, and my brother, joining the general current, was soon swept along by the flood. He attended the various open-air meetings held in his neighbourhood, at first possibly more out of mere idle curiosity than for any other reason. In fact, for a long time he was little more than a spectator, or if he ventured to essay a remark at any time it would be on the side of orthodoxy. The principal meeting-place was Bonner's Fields, where the Victoria-park Hospital for the Diseases of the Chest now stands. Here groups, composed mostly of men, varying in number from fifty to five hundred, would congregate. Raised on little hillocks or accumulations of rubbish above the heads of the bystanders, the various speakers would air their social, political, or theological opinions. Temperance advocacy was then, comparatively speaking, in its infancy, and in the centre of one such group might be seen and heard some champion of the cause, who, speaking with the fervour of an emancipated slave, would be sending forth winged words, some of which not only arrested my brother, but caused him too to battle for the right in the same direction for many years after. Around the expounders of the five points of the Charter a still larger company would be gathered; others would gather around those engaged in religious discussion. It was in such heterogeneous company that my brother found himself thrown at the early age of sixteen. In this exciting atmosphere, it is not at all surprising that, oblivious to the fact of his own want of fitness for the task, with that zeal, rashness, or boldness—call it what you will—a trait of character so prominent in after life, he challenged one of the secularist advocates to discuss the question of the inspiration of the Bible.

Poor Charlie, at a loss for arguments to

repel the objections brought by his opponent, Mr. J. Savage, in that first discussion, the poor boy imagined, because he was vanquished, the Bible was overthrown too. What other result could be expected than the defeat of the novice at the hands of the propagandist? Speaking of this episode in the life of my brother, A. S. Headingley says, "After this, to him, memorable struggle, Bradlaugh was obliged to confess that he could not hold out any longer. Frankly recognising that he was beaten, he soon proclaimed himself a Freethinker."

It is alleged that about this time my brother, while preparing for confirmation, encountered difficulties in the study of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England and the four Gospels, and "forthwith wrote to the Rev. John Graham Packer, the incumbent of St. Peter's, Hackney road, soliciting his aid and some explanation. Instead of showing discretion and self-control in such a matter," it is stated that the Rev. J. G. Packer "lost his temper and wrote to his parents, denouncing the inquiries of their son as atheistical, and, further, suspended him for three months from his office as Sunday-school teacher." Now, it is impossible for me to speak here without appearing to cast a reflection on one whose tongue is silent, and whose pen is no longer mightier than the sword; but on this *ex parte* view of the case, to say the least, have not certain London ministers unnecessarily gone out of their way to hold up, from their pulpits, this clergyman to obloquy and contempt? Ministers of the Gospel should always speak gently of the dead, especially when they are referring to one of their own calling, ever remembering that the laudation of one dead man at the expense of another is to inflict a deep wound in the hearts of those who survive the one maligned.

An appeal to admitted facts will clearly prove that the Rev. J. G. Packer's offence was no very heinous one, and the very worst construction to be put upon it is that he might have acted more wisely in dealing with his inquirer. Had my brother's biographers stated clearly which of the Thirty-nine Articles were stumbling blocks and what were the difficulties presented in the four Gospels, some opinion might be even now formed as to whether the late John Graham Packer, together with my father, acted harshly or otherwise towards my brother; because any minister, whether Episcopalian or Nonconformist, who would declare the *whole* of the Thirty-nine Articles unscriptural, would scarcely be a safe guide for his people to follow. Adolphe S. Headingley

says in
ventured
and su
"Diege
charac
the nam
was in
discour
Church
copy of
contrad
most b
from th
ing my
literatu
brother
the tru
but ra
consequ
conduc
this ac
ent co
minist
Aft
Rev. J
and it
dent t
road t
sure t
him f
may r
ister
sever
minis
hims
more
it ha
been
circu
It
Pack
emp
opin
min
this
on t
phy
with
wor
thes
tion
thin
nev
T
bio
one
on
age
pre
con
for

says in the winter of 1849 Bradlaugh again ventured to approach the Rev. J. G. Packer, and submitted to him Robert Taylor's "Diegesis." Few know the nature and character of this work. The author went by the name of the "Devil's Chaplain," as he was in the habit of delivering blasphemous discourses attired as a clergyman of the Church of England. I am possessed of a copy of this work, and can, without fear of contradiction, assert that it is one of the most blasphemous productions ever issued from the Freethought press, notwithstanding my intimate acquaintance with atheistic literature. This action on the part of my brother, therefore, would scarcely betoken the true humility of an anxious inquirer, but rather the spirit of braggadocio; and consequently, in looking at Mr. Packer's conduct at a previous stage in the light of this admitted fact, it certainly bears a different colour to that put upon it by brother ministers.

After receiving Taylor's "Diegesis," the Rev. J. G. Packer consulted with my father, and it was deemed advisable, as it was evident that my brother was now fairly on the road to pronounced Atheism to bring pressure to bear upon the lad, in order to save him from going to the bad altogether. It may not have been the wisest step for a minister and a father to take, but before being severe in censure, may it not be well for every minister and parent reading these lines to ask himself the question, Should I have acted more wisely—nay, should I have as well—if it had been a member of my flock, if it had been my son, and I had been placed in like circumstances?

It had been arranged that the Rev. J. G. Packer should inform my brother "that his employers gave him three days to change his opinions or lose his situation." Though ministers and others have made so much of this, what were my brother's own feelings on the subject in after life? In the biography by A. S. Headingley, and published with the approval of my brother, these words occur: "Bradlaugh, looking back at these circumstances with the calmer reflection which years bring, is now inclined to think that the threat would probably have never been enforced."

This incident is thus described by his biographer: "When threats are used on one side, resistance is generally forthcoming on the other, and Bradlaugh, even at that age, was the last person to recant his expressed opinions merely out of fear for the consequences they might entail. He therefore determined to leave home and fight

the battle of life. Bradlaugh was barely seventeen years old when he found himself in the streets of London." One source of anxiety Bradlaugh was, however, spared; his parents did not institute any pursuit, simply for this reason—his whereabouts were known, his lodgings being in the same street.

Only a few brief months had flitted by after leaving home before my brother found himself, like the prodigal of old, "in want." His occupation during that period has been thus described: "When he was not lecturing or seeking to sell coals or braces, he was engaged preparing himself for discussion by studying Hebrew, Greek, and other tongues, or, it should be added, in making love to Miss Hypatia Carlile. Being proud, penniless, and inelegant in his dress, he naturally, with the unreasoning impulsiveness of youth, added to his other troubles that of falling hopelessly in love. Fortunately, considering the state of affairs, his affections were not returned."

It is clear from this that under such embarrassing circumstances little or no progress could have been made during this period in studies of any kind, and therefore, though the greatest credit is due to my brother for the use he made in after life of any early advantages that he may have received, that education and training that fitted him for the office of orderly-room clerk was what he obtained at the hands of my father, and therefore it is a positive reflection on the memory of that dead father to say that my brother's early education was of a most meagre description.

The grip of poverty becoming more and more intense a short time before Christmas, 1850, my brother, too proud to return home, determined to put an end to a crisis which had already been prolonged beyond endurance. This he did by taking "the Queen's shilling" and enlisting in the 7th Dragoon Guards. My father, immediately upon hearing of the step that my brother had taken, had an interview with him at the depot at Westminster; and as my brother was determined to remain in the service, my father obtained permission from the commanding officer for my brother to spend the Christmas Day at home, on condition that my father himself brought my brother back to his quarters at night.

I well remember my brother arriving at breakfast time, dining with the family, and leaving in the evening with my father. My father and brother kept up a regular correspondence all the time my brother was in Ireland, but he never saw my father again,

my father only surviving my brother's departure from home about eighteen months.

On the death of my father, my brother obtained a furlough and came home for a fortnight. I opened the door to him, and shall never forget his paroxysms of grief or forget the cry of anguish of my big soldier-brother when he discovered that my father had been buried some days. "If I could only have knelt by his coffin and asked his forgiveness!" was his repeated cry.

At the expiration of his furlough he returned to Ireland, keeping up a regular correspondence with his mother, constantly informing her of the hatred he had towards his captain, saying that unless she obtained his discharge he would put a bullet through this officer.

And here let me repeat what I wrote in my own autobiography in January, 1882: "As in many books and pamphlets containing a record of my brother's life the statement has appeared to the effect that, in consequence of the death of an aunt, who left him a legacy, he secured his discharge from the army, I wish it to be distinctly understood that there is no foundation whatever for such a statement, as my mother and no one else purchased my brother's discharge from the 7th Dragoon Guards on the eve of the commencement of the Crimean War. This explanation is necessary, inasmuch as Secularists are constantly questioning the truth of my affirmation in this particular, and my dear mother, being dead, cannot be appealed to."

My brother returned home in November, 1853, and having been nearly the whole three years of his service orderly-room clerk, he received from Colonel Ainslie a "very good character." Soon after this he entered the office of Mr. Rogers, solicitor, Fenchurch-street. As from this period the life-history of my late brother is common property, for the purposes of this article there is no need, so far as it concerns my brother, to carry this narrative further.

JOHN WESLEY.

BY ARCHDEACON FARRAR, D.D.

From *The Contemporary Review* (London), March, 1891.

MARCH 2, 1891, is the centenary of the death of John Wesley. Many biographies of him have been written, and the minutest incidents of his life are familiar to the members of the religious community who

are called by his name. Others are far less acquainted with his personality, and may not be sorry to be reminded what manner of man he was.

For, indeed, the reformers of Churches, the redressers of injustice, the reawakeners of dead consciences, the slayers of dragons and monsters, have in all ages been men marked out to their great work by similar characteristics. They who would beat down the hundred-headed hydra of inveterate evils must use the same Hercules-club of moral conviction and absolute self-sacrifice.

The father of John Wesley was the good Vicar of Epworth, and laboured for long years in poverty, disappointment, debt, and many trials, amid a rude, hostile, and heavy peasantry. John and his brothers and sisters in a numerous family had, to his own great advantage, to bear the yoke in their youth. Mrs. Wesley was an able, active, and deeply religious woman. She gave herself up, heart and soul, to her home duties and the right education of her children. We are told that she taught her children, even as infants, to cry softly, and trained the little boys and girls in habits of the finest Christian courtesy.

The discipline of those days was stern; but in the hands of a good and wise mother it probably erred far less in the direction of sternness than ours does in the direction of effeminacy. Mrs. Wesley set apart an hour every day to talk and pray with her boys in turn, and retained a powerful spell of influence over them, even to advanced age. She did much to mould Wesley's character. In spite of the opposition of the commonplace curate of the parish, and the timid doubts of her own husband, when he was absent in London for the meetings of Convocation, she assembled the parishioners together in her kitchen to a service, which they found more profitable and blessed than the dry and soulless ministrations of the parish church.

The little John and Charles were present at these meetings, and we see in them the germ and spirit of their future work.

Brought up in such a home, John Wesley grew up so serious, so earnest, and so promising a child that even at the age of eight years his father admitted him to the Holy Communion. His impressions had been deepened by his remarkable escape from the burning ruins of his father's vicarage when he was six years old. Epworth parsonage was destroyed by fire. The children were all asleep, and John, left alone in the blazing nursery, was only snatched from

death at
efforts of
From the
God, and
out for
publicat
beneath
not this

He te
not cons
sin, or
At that
don, at
schools
rough
of muc
Wesley
religio
go to c
both r
him as
ing Ho
his fau
as rise
of spir
in the

In
ford.
his ol
he go
him t
ance
The
time
deed
of E
chan
tingu
made
ber h
hour
ened
he v
and
prop
heal

A
Fell
utat
fam
nes
Chr
clos
nas
ide
"P
sti
Ca
he
of
tis

death at the last moment, after the vain efforts of his father to reach the room. From that day his mother dedicated him to God, and regarded him as a child marked out for great ends. In one of his early publications a house in flames is represented beneath his portrait, with the words, "Is not this a brand plucked out of the fire?"

He tells us that till the age of ten he was not conscious of having committed any grave sin, or of having lost the grace of baptism. At that age he was sent to school in London, at the Charterhouse. English public schools in those days were not only very rough training places, but were also scenes of much vice and godlessness. But though Wesley as a schoolboy lost some of his deep religious seriousness, he still continued to go to church, to read his Bible, and to pray both morning and evening. We hear of him as a "brave boy, a good scholar, learning Hebrew as fast as he can," and probably his faults were not more serious than such as rise from a natural buoyancy and hilarity of spirit, which thinks but little of religion in the glow and bloom of opening life.

In 1720 he went to Christ Church, Oxford. Although at first he did not recover his old piety, we hear of no fault except that he got into debt; and it was difficult for him to do otherwise with the slender allowance which alone his father could afford. The religious atmosphere of Oxford at that time was singularly cold and dead, as indeed was that of England, and the Church of England generally. But a decided change soon passed over him. Without extinguishing a natural cheerfulness which made him say that he could never remember being in bad spirits for a quarter of an hour all his life, a sense of religion awakened him to deep seriousness. Young as he was, he wrote to his mother, "Leisure and I have taken leave of one another. I propose to be busy as long as I live, if my health is so long indulged me."

After taking his degree, he was elected a Fellow of Lincoln, and acquired much reputation as an Oxford tutor. Various books fanned the flame of his religious earnestness. Thomas à Kempis, by the "Imitatio Christi," woke in his mind the desire for a closer walk with God; and the purely monastic and ascetic elements of à Kempis's ideal were corrected by Jeremy Taylor's "Holy Living and Dying." His soul was stirred still more deeply by Law's "Serious Call" and "Perfection." By these books, he says, "I was convinced more than ever of the impossibility of being half a Christian, and determined to be all devoted to

God; to give Him all my soul, my body, and my substance."

He was ordained Deacon by Bishop Potter, and never forgot his advice: "If you wish to be extensively useful, do not spend your time in contending for or against things of a disputable nature, but in testifying against notorious vice, and in promoting real, essential holiness." Another remarkable sentence was addressed to him when he was ordained Priest. Dr. Hayward, Bishop Potter's examining chaplain, put to him a question on which he often pondered, and of which his whole after-history was an illustration: "Do you know," he asked him, "what you are about? You are bidding defiance to all mankind. He that would live a Christian priest ought to know that, whether his hand be against every man or no, he must expect every man's hand would be against him." He had already learnt by experience the truth of the remark, for his very goodness, his blameless morals, his efforts to help others, were made grounds for sneers and opposition.

To any one who looks a little below the surface, and watches the reception accorded in our own age, as much as in any other, to any line of conduct not purely conventional, this will not appear wholly strange. No one in these days would openly venture to taunt another in the House of Commons as "the honourable and *religious* gentleman," as one member of Parliament taunted Wilberforce; nor would many men make personal chastity a ground for depreciatory innuendoes, as in the eighteenth century they did to the younger Pitt. But when Wesley stood for election to his fellowship at Lincoln College, there were some who tried to ruin his chance by ridiculing his serious behaviour; and he wrote to his father to ask for his advice. The letter of his father was admirable. "Does any body think," wrote the Vicar of Epworth, "that the devil is dead, or asleep, or that he has no agents left? Surely virtue can bear being laughed at. The Captain and Master endured something more for us before He entered into His glory, and unless we track His steps, in vain do we hope to share the glory with Him." Yet we are astonished to read that in those days, at an Oxford College, to attend the Sacrament was to make oneself a target for all the polite students, and the practice of visiting the poor was an offence to be punished with the threat of expulsion. Indeed, so serious did the opposition gradually become, that Wesley again sought his father's counsel. His father wrote that

he rejoiced to have two sons at Oxford—for Charles had now joined his elder brother, John—"to whom God has given grace and courage to turn the war against the world and the devil, which is the best way to conquer them. . . . Go on, then, in God's name, in the path to which your Saviour hath directed you : . . . walk prudently, though not fearfully. I doubt whether a mortal can arrive at a greater degree of perfection than steadily to do good, and for that very reason, patiently and meekly to suffer evil. Bear no more sail than is necessary, but steer steady."

In 1727 Wesley went to assist his father in the rude hamlet of Wroote, where he stayed till 1729. He tells us that he did not see much fruit of his labours, because, in his preaching, he neither laid the foundation of repentance nor of believing the Gospel, but rather assumed that his hearers were already believers and already penitent. In 1729 he returned to Oxford to find that his brother Charles had there founded a little brotherhood of students to encourage each other in the practice of a holy life. They met for prayer, self-examination, the study of the Scriptures and the Greek Testament. Later on they formed plans to visit the sick and the prisoners. They were nicknamed "the Holy Club," and Whitefield was one of the little band. They were also called by that name "Methodists," which still adheres to the Society of which they formed the earliest nucleus. The name Methodist had first been invented in the reign of Nero, for a school of physicians who thought that "all diseases could be cured by a specific method of diet and exercise."* Charles Wesley, who was of a more poetic, tender, and emotional cast of mind than John, had been the first leader in the movement, and he added a glow of warmer spirituality to the harder and more prosaic temperament of his brother. The numbers of this little Society were never large. Some of its members died early; others fell away before the discouragement and ridicule heaped upon them. But John and Charles Wesley, and George Whitefield—the organiser, the poet, the orator of the Wesleyan movement—went on until they had become the revivers in England of a dead and torpid religionism; the standard-bearers of what might well have seemed to be a forlorn hope; the voices which cried over the valley of dry bones, "Come from the

four winds, O breath, and breathe upon these slain that they may live."

In October 1735, the two brothers sailed with General Oglethorpe to Georgia. John's object was to sacrifice himself, not only as a chaplain to the emigrants, but also as a missionary to the American Indians. This was probably the least fruitful and the least happy episode in the lives of the young evangelists. Both of them were still High Churchmen of the old Anglican school, with strong notions of discipline. John never scrupled to reprove any one, not only for notorious sins, but for anything—such as dress, or what he regarded as levity in conduct; and he excited deadly animosities by repelling from the Holy Communion any one who did not come up to his ideal standard, or who had not given him previous notice. His life, indeed, was as blameless and noble as it always was; but we see in his conduct a certain hardness and autocracy, and want of sympathy and tact. Yet, nothing could exceed his earnestness and self-sacrifice. He had but a small salary, he ate but little, he drank no wine, he limited his hours of sleep, he rose at four in the morning, he laboured incessantly at preaching, visiting, and teaching. The early colonists were of various nations, and therefore he read prayers to them in Italian, in French, and in German, as well as in English; and since he also taught the children of his schools, his Sundays were days of incessant and astonishing labour. "During his journeys in the colony he often slept all night in the open air, exposed to all the dews that fell. Sometimes he was wet through with dew and rain. He wore Indian shoes, and slept rolled up in a blanket. Though he travelled through places infested with wild beasts, he would never carry a weapon; he said that he had a cane to try the depths of the rivers through which he had to wade, but would not have a ferrule at the end of it lest it should look like a weapon." One instance of his sincerity and self-denial is well worth recording. At Savannah he was told that some of the schoolboys were inclined to despise others who came to school without shoes and stockings. How was he to cure this? He did, what not perhaps one teacher out of a million would have thought of doing, he himself went barefoot to teach them! The boys could no longer look down on comrades who came to school without shoes and stockings, when their own teacher—clergyman, and scholar, and gentleman as he was—came to school shoeless and stockingless! They were amazed; but he kept them to their books, and before

* Auson, "Idyll," ix. 67: "Triplex quoque forma mendendi Cui logos, et *methodos*, cuique experientia nomen."

"As many more
As *methodist* Musus killed with hellebore."
MARSTON, *Scourge of Villany*, 1590.

the end of the week had cured them of their vanity.

It is the custom to speak of Wesley's mission to Georgia as a failure. A failure it was *not*. Whitefield, who followed him to Georgia, even ventures to say "The good which Mr. John Wesley has done in America is inexpressible. His name is very precious among the people, and he has laid a foundation that I hope neither men nor devils will ever be able to shake." He felt, however, that he was flinging away his best years in a partial effort. He was driven to return to England, which he only reached in February 1738, after trying and dangerous adventures. He would hardly have survived the perils of this journey but for the fine health and unbroken cheerfulness which were the result and the reward of his habitual temperance, soberness, and chastity. By self-discipline he had strengthened a constitution so naturally weak that, but for it, instead of living to eighty-eight, he would certainly have been cut off in early manhood.

This fine health and simple diet enabled him rapidly to get over the misery of seasickness in his homeward voyage, and during the six weeks that it occupied, his work was characteristically energetic. Overcoming his reluctance, he went among the sailors, and spoke individually to every one of them. He taught the cabin-boy. He instructed two poor negroes who were on board. To the single French passenger he talked in French, and every day explained to him a chapter of the New Testament; and all this while he continued his own personal studies.

Yet, among these noble, evangelistic, apostolical, self-denying labours, Wesley, in his own opinion, had not yet found the light. "It is now two years," he wrote, "and eight months since I left my native country to teach the Indians the nature of Christianity. But what have I learned myself in the meantime? Why, (what I the least of all expected) that I, who went to America to convert others, was never myself converted to God."

His misgivings were the result of intercourse with simple, earnest, devout Moravians on his voyage out. He had consulted a Moravian minister named Spangenberg about his work. Spangenberg asked him a few questions. His first question surprised Wesley. It was, "Does the Spirit of God bear witness with your spirit that you are a child of God?" Wesley, a little astonished at the question, hesitated for an answer. "Do you know Jesus Christ?" said Spangenberg. "I know," said Wesley, "that

he is the Saviour of the world." "True," said the Moravian, "but do you know that He has saved *you*?" "I hope," said Wesley, "He has died to save me." Spangenberg only added, "Do you know yourself?" "I do," said Wesley; "but," he adds at a later time, "I fear they were vain words."

He dated his full conversion from the time of his conversations with a young Moravian missionary, Peter Böhler, who taught him a simpler form of the Gospel, and brought home to him the Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith. "By him," says Wesley, "in the hand of the great God on March 5, 1738, I was clearly convinced of unbelief, of the want of that faith by which alone we are saved." He at once concluded that he was unfit to preach, but Böhler urged him to go on. "But what can I preach?" asked Wesley. "Preach faith till you have it," said his friend, "and then you will preach faith, because you have it." For a time he remained in uncertainty and heaviness, but on May 26, 1738, at five in the morning, he opened his New Testament at the words, "There are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises." That day, at St. Paul's, he heard the anthem, "Out of the deeps have I called unto Thee, O Lord," and in the evening he went to a little religious meeting, where some one was reading Luther's preface to the Epistle to the Romans. "About a quarter before nine," says Wesley, "while he was describing the change which God works in the heart through faith in Christ, I felt my heart strangely warmed. I felt I did trust in Christ, Christ alone, for salvation; and an assurance was given me that He had taken away my sins, even mine, and saved me from the law of sin and death."

Shortly afterward, at the house of his friend Mr. Hutton, in College Street, Westminster, Wesley surprised a little company of friends by telling them that five days before he had not been a Christian. "Have a care, Mr. Wesley," said Mr. Hutton, "how you despise the benefits received by the two Sacraments." "If you have not been a Christian ever since I knew you," said Mrs. Hutton, "you have been a great hypocrite, for you made us all believe that you were one." Wesley explained what he had meant. He said, "When we renounce everything but faith, and get into Christ, then, and not till then, have we any reason to believe that we are Christians." He considered that up to that time he had only had the faith of a servant, not the peace and assurance of a son.

In this narrative is contained the secret of all the mighty work of revival which Wesley lived to achieve in England. A gentleman, a scholar, a High Churchman, a presbyter of the English Church, a fellow of an Oxford college, there would have been nothing even in the sincerity of his piety to lead to the great work of his life—nothing to uplift him above the somnolent respectability of the ordinary easy-going Christian—if he had not learnt from the Moravians something of the depth of their convictions, and the flame of their devoted zeal. It is needless to follow the further incidents of his life. It was spent, without any intermission, in the fullest work of an evangelist to masses of his fellow countrymen, whom the Church of England for the most part neglected and ignored, and whom it was his mission to convert from the practical heathendom into which they had fallen.

His vast success was owing, first and foremost, to his inspiring conviction that he was doing the work to which God had called him, and doing it with God's visible benediction. But no small part of the supreme impression which he made upon his age was due to the character which has left to all time a luminous example. In his case, as in all cases, self-sacrifice was infinitely fruitful. That spirit of self-sacrifice inspired especially his generosity, his courage, and his high endurance.

I. The example of such generosity as Wesley's is not only rare, but almost unique. He rose completely superior to that mammon-worship and avarice which are the sunken reefs on which so many a vessel of human life is shattered, and most of all as it nears the close of its voyage. It was one of the principles of the Holy Club to give away every year whatever of their income remained after they had provided for their own actual necessities. Wesley was foremost in this good work. "I abridged myself," he says, "of all superfluities, and many that are called necessities of life." When he had an income of £30 a year, he lived on £28, and gave away the rest. Next year he received £60, and gave away £32 in charity. The next year, still confining his whole personal expenses to £28, he gave away £62; and the year after £90. In other words, he gave away treble of what he spent, when his whole income was only £118 a year.

Wesley, on less than the income of many an artisan, was able to found a school of twenty children; to clothe some, if not all of them; and to pay the mistress. And he continued this principle all through his life.

When he was sixty-three years old, a lady left him £1000, probably the largest sum he ever had in his possession. But in reference to it, Wesley simply said: "I am God's steward for the poor." To the poor it was so speedily distributed that when, a year later, his sister, who had been deserted by a worthless husband, applied for some of it, he wrote back: "You do not consider: money never stays with me; it would burn me if it did. I throw it out of my hands as soon as possible, lest it should find a way into my heart. You should have spoken to me before Miss Lewen's money flew away." Yet one of the numerous lies which religious wickedness, and irreligious wickedness was incessantly telling of him without a blush, was that he "made a good thing" out of Methodism!

A clergyman, who wrote one of the very numerous clerical pamphlets against Wesley, said "that after preaching so much against laying by money, he had put out £700 to interest." He replied; "I never put sixpence out to interest since I was born, and never had £100 of my own together since I came into the world."

He might have had thousands of pounds a year of his own, had he so chosen. The books he published in favour of Methodism were absolutely his own private property, and were very lucrative; but he gave all this money away. In one of his note books, when he was an extremely old man, he wrote: "For upwards of sixty-eight years I have kept my accounts exactly. I will not attempt it any longer, being satisfied with the continual conviction that I save all I can, and give all I can, that is all I have." In 1782, he spent £5 19s. for clothes, and gave away £738. Never a rich man, he gave away in his lifetime perhaps £40,000.

II. Another great quality in Wesley's character was his heroic and unflinching courage. The world bestows a somewhat disproportionate admiration upon physical courage. But Wesley showed that highest form of physical courage which is not spasmodic, which is not only called out by a crisis, but which is required as a constant habit of life. And it was voluntary courage. It was courage in perplexing duties which were not demanded of him. We might think it strange that the desire to preach the gospel of Christ should evoke such deadly opposition, alike of the so-called respectable and religious classes, and of the rude and ignorant multitude. Yet, so it was. Wesley, and those who worked with him, never had any other object than to offer the highest boon which

earth can give to those for whom there was no love and no pity among the religious classes. Yet he was opposed with infuriated violence. Every form of opposition, we are told, was tried against him. "Mill dams were let out; church bells were jangled; drunken fiddlers and ballad singers were hired; organs pealed forth; drums were beaten;" street-vendors, clowns, drunken fops, and Papists were hired, and incited to brawl or blow horns, so as to drown his voice. He was struck in the face with sticks, he was cursed and groaned at, pelted with stones, beaten to the ground, threatened with murder, dragged and hustled hither and thither by drinking, cursing, swearing, riotous mobs, who acted the part of judge, jury, and executioner. "Knock him down and kill him at once," was the shout of the brutal roughs who assaulted him at Wednesbury. On more than one occasion, a mad or a baited bull was driven into the midst of his assemblies; the windows of the houses in which he stayed were broken, and rioters burst their way even into his private rooms. "The men," says Dr. Taylor, "who commenced and continued this arduous service—and they were scholars and gentlemen—displayed a courage far surpassing that which carries the soldier through the hailstorm of the battle field. Ten thousand might more easily be found who would confront a battery than two who, with the sensitiveness of education about them, could (in that day) mount a table by the roadside, give out a Psalm, and gather a mob."

III. To face all this, and to face it day after day, and year by year, in England, in Scotland, in Wales, in Cornwall, in Ireland, required a supreme bravery, and persistence. Yet it needed even greater courage to meet hurricanes of abuse and tornadoes of slander. Wesley had to face this also on all sides. The most popular actors of the day held him up to odium and ridicule in lewd comedies. Reams of calumny were written against him; shoals of pamphlets, full of virulence and falsehood, were poured forth from the press. The most simple, the most innocent, the most generous of men, he was called a smuggler, a liar, an immoral and designing intriguer, a Pope, a Jesuit, a swindler, the most notorious hypocrite living. The clergy, I grieve to say, led the way. Rowland Hill called Wesley "a lying Apostle, a designing wolf, a dealer in stolen wares"; and said that he was "as unprincipled as a rook, and as silly as a jackdaw, first pilfering his neighbour's plumage, and then going proudly forth to display it to a

laughing world." Augustus Toplady said, among floods of other and worse abuse, that "for thirty years he had been endeavouring to palm on his credulous followers his pernicious doctrines, with all the sophistry of a Jesuit, and the dictatorial authority of a Pope"; and described him as "the most rancorous hater of the gospel system that ever appeared in England." Bishop Lavington, of Exeter, denounced the Methodists as a dangerous and presumptuous sect, animated with an enthusiastical and fanatical spirit; and said that they were "either innocent madmen or infamous cheats." Bishop Gibson, of London, actually made it one of his grounds of complaint against them that "they have had the boldness to preach in the fields and other open places, and by public advertisement to invite the *rabble* to be their hearers"; and he was indignant because Methodists thronged to the Holy Communion in such numbers that the clergymen had no time to dine before afternoon service! The revival of religion had to make its way among hostile Bishops, furious controversialists, jibing and libellous newspapers, angry men of the world, prejudiced juries, and brutal lies. And yet it prevailed, because "one with God is always in a majority."

Wesley's labours were marvellous. He is described as a man not well fed or of Herculean frame, but slight and frail;—as a man without indulgences, feeding for eight months every year chiefly at the tables of the poor; wifeless, childless, homeless, yet always cheerful, always happy, always hard at work, even to the age of eighty-eight flying with all the sprightliness of youth through the three kingdoms, preaching twice every day, indoors and out of doors, in churches, chapels, cottages, and sheds, and everywhere superintending the complex and growing interests of the numerous Societies which had sprung into buoyant being through the labours of himself and his godly helpers. Once show him the path of duty, and with a dauntless step he trod it. Nothing frightened him out of it. Nothing could allure him from it. However arduous the work, however great the privations, if his Master bade him go he went. "My brother Charles," he once remarked, "among the difficulties of our early ministry, used to say: 'If the Lord would give me wings, I would fly.' I used to answer: 'If the Lord bids me fly, I would trust Him for the wings.'" Happily he outlived years of hatred, and died in honour. His work began in an undergraduate's room at Oxford,

and, when he died, there were 120,000 members of his Societies. There are now 5,250,000, under 33,000 ministers, and if children and general worshippers be counted, there are, perhaps, 25,000,000. Might he not say now, in the words which he chose for his text when he laid the foundation stone of the City Road Chapel, "This hath God wrought"? In Westminster Abbey thousands gaze with interest on the beautiful memorial which has been raised to him and his brother—the presentment of their faces in white marble not whiter than their lives. On it are carved three of his memorable sayings. One is: "I look on all the world as my parish." Another is: "God buries His workmen, but continues His work." The third is his ejaculation: "The best of all is, God is with us." He uttered it on his death-bed, and then, once more, raising his arm and lifting his voice in grateful triumph, he emphatically repeated, "*The best of all is, God is with us!*"

Such was John Wesley. Exactly one hundred years have elapsed since his death, and now we can judge him aright. He was a man, and therefore by no means exempt from the faults and errors which spring from our human limitations; but few men have been more supremely faithful to the best he knew. My object in this paper has merely been to sketch the outline of his life, and to indicate those conditions of his labour and of his character which secured to one who in genius was not equal to many of his contemporaries the supreme honour of evoking the dormant religious instincts of millions of human souls. It is not possible in this paper to describe the great revival which roused England from the general slumber and the wide-spread godlessness of the eighteenth century; but the impulse which Wesley gave has not yet wholly spent its force, and the electric flash which he thrilled into drowsy hearts is still potent to kindle the phenomena and the reality of life. The Evangelical movement, the Oxford movement, even the recent enthusiasm of the Salvation Army, are traceable to his example, and to the convictions which he inspired. Faithfulness, energy, sincerity like his will never be ineffectual. He outlived the rage of the vicious whom he rebuked, and the jealousy of the neglectful who were shamed by his efforts and envious of his success. He has taken his secure place among the benefactors of mankind, and furnished one more illustration of the truth that

"Good deeds cannot die:
They with the sun and moon revive their light,
For ever blessing those that look on them."

THE INFLUENCE OF WESLEYANISM ON CALVINISM.

BY REV. LEWIS F. STEARNS, D.D., PROFESSOR
OF CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY IN BANGOR
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

From *The Independent*, New York, March 5, 1891.

DURING the century and a half which have passed since the Wesleyan movement began, its great theological rival Calvinism has undergone some important modifications. It would not be true to ascribe these changes wholly to Wesleyanism. The system of the Genevan reformer had begun to feel the influence of a new life before Methodism made its appearance. When Wesley was just emerging into the joy and peace of Christian assurance, and Whitefield's preaching was tracing its first triumphs in white gutters on the grimy cheeks of the Kingswood colliers, four years had already elapsed since the commencement of the great revival in Northampton under Jonathan Edwards. In truth the Calvinistic *renaissance* and the movement which bears the name of the Wesleys were independent elements in the great revival of vital Christianity by which the reign of rationalism was brought to an end and the modern era of Anglo-Saxon Protestantism initiated. Each had its own principle, its own method, and its own problem to solve. Each would have had its history, if the other had not existed.

But while this is the case, the two movements have stood in close relations during all their history, and exerted an important reciprocal influence. We cannot, therefore, account for the changes which have taken place in the Calvinistic system without giving due credit to the constant impulse derived from Wesleyanism. The Calvinism of our times, in both its conservative and its liberal forms, shows the modifying effects of the sister system.

These effects may be brought under three heads, according as they relate to methods of Christian work, to the spiritual life, and to doctrine.

1. We see the influence of Wesleyanism on Calvinism in the modern methods of Christian work. The old Calvinism cannot be said to have been deeply imbued with the missionary spirit. It was content that the Church should hold its own, and did not much concern itself about its increase. In its work it confined itself to the use of the ordinary means of grace, the stated preaching of the Word, the instruction of the young, the personal use of the Bible.

Modern Calvinism, born as it was in the great revivals of the last century, has had from the first a distinctively missionary character, and its methods of work have been evangelistic. It has come more and more to recognize the necessity of carrying the Gospel to men, of urging it upon their acceptance, of drawing its motives from the feelings as well as from the intellect and the will, of making use of the contagious power of a common interest in religious things. The ideal of the early Calvinism was that of a waiting Church, looking to God to do all the work in his own good time and way; and it waited until it became dead and powerless. The ideal of the latter Calvinism is that of a working Church, which knows itself to be the instrument of God in redeeming the world. Out of this spirit has come all our modern evangelism and mission work.

In the attainment of this better and more fruitful method, Calvinism has been constantly stirred up to zeal and good works by its Wesleyan rival, which from the first has been a missionary and evangelistic system. It has been impossible for the Calvinistic Churches, whether at home, or in the new regions of our country, or on the foreign mission field, to fall back into the old methods. Working alongside of their Methodist brethren, they have continually felt the power of their example and been stimulated by it to more zealous effort.

2. Hardly less strong has been the influence of Wesleyanism on the spiritual life of Calvinism. The latter, while containing all the elements which make for spirituality, has always had to contend against an inherent rationalistic tendency. It asserts all three of the Saviour's offices, but it has been too prone to exalt the prophetic and priestly at the expense of the kingly. It has turned men's thoughts too exclusively to what the Saviour accomplished for our redemption when he was on earth and has too much ignored what he is now, the exalted King, reigning from the throne of majesty on high, everywhere active through his Spirit, "subduing us to himself, ruling and defending us, and restraining and conquering all his and our enemies." It was this tendency in the old Calvinism which facilitated the deistic movement in Great Britain, and later the Unitarian defection in our own country.

But Wesleyanism has stood from the beginning for the immediate and constant presence of Christ through the Spirit. Herein it has differed heavenwide from the cold and lifeless Arminianism which prevailed at the time it first made its appearance, and with

which it has sometimes, though most unjustly, been confounded. Its doctrines of regeneration, of Christian assurance, of sanctification, have all sprung from this root. The emphasis it has laid upon Christian experience is to be explained in the same way. It has indeed often given too large a place to the emotional element in Christianity. But it has done so, not so much for the sake of the feelings themselves as that it might realize the presence of Christ's Spirit, to whom the feelings are due. To it belongs the credit of having kept alive in a sense-bound age, as perhaps no other religious system has done, the consciousness of the reality of the things unseen and eternal—the Father, the Christ, the Spirit, the Kingdom of God, the forgiveness of sins, the present divine grace. Here has lain largely the secret of its power.

The modern Calvinism, beginning as it did in the great revivals of the last century, possessed a like spirituality. We see it at its best in books like that of Edwards on the Religious Affections. But many agencies have tended to obscure it and bring back the old rationalism. That modern Calvinism, in spite of these opposing agencies, has succeeded to so great an extent in maintaining and increasing its spirituality, is due in no inconsiderable degree to the power of Wesleyanism.

3. This brings us to consider the influence of Wesleyanism upon the doctrinal system of Calvinism. Few would deny that this system has undergone very important changes during the last hundred and fifty years. To realize their extent we must turn not to the text-books of systematic theology, but to the preaching of our ministers. Even the most conservative modern Calvinists preach very differently from their predecessors of the last century, or even of the earlier part of the present century.

The change consists not so much in the repudiation of the old doctrines as in the acceptance and due employment of a complementary and modifying series of doctrines. Calvinism in its central and distinctive principles has a right of existence of which it will never be deprived, however much it may be modified. The infinite and the finite meet in the religious and Christian experience. Both elements have their place, and they are together necessary to the full truth. But no finite mind can unite them in one satisfactory formula; for, as has been truly said, there is no common measure between the infinite and the finite. To be sure of the full truth we must hold on to both, even though we are hopeless of reconciling them.

The Calvinist starts from the Infinite. He

begins with God. He believes that he is the Author and Ruler of all things. He insists upon the entire supremacy of God in Nature and in grace. His formula is that "God hath foreordained whatsoever comes to pass." Every man who can say that, with all that it implies, is in some true sense a Calvinist. No man who holds it can be rightfully called an Arminian. For there is a mighty deal involved in this formula. It implies that the free acts of men are included in the divine decrees as truly as the necessary effects of Nature, though in a different way, the sinful acts as well as the holy acts, though permissively and not efficiently. It implies that the destiny of all men is included, their salvation or their perdition. It implies, if consistently carried out, that God might have prevented the present amount of sin, or all sin. The Calvinist will not stumble at these consequences. He regards the Arminian, who would deny the universality of the divine plan, who would confine it in its relation to men to classes rather than extend it to individuals, who would base it upon the divine foreknowledge, and who would derive the theodicy rather from human freedom than from the wise counsels of God, as superficial and illogical.

But while this position has its right of existence and can never be deprived of it, it ought to be held in connection with the other side, that complementary range of truths which cannot indeed be wholly harmonized with it, from lack of the common measure, but which has an equal right of existence.

It was here that the old Calvinism failed. It emphasized too exclusively the divine factor! It made God all in all. It attempted logically to unite the Infinite and the finite, and wholly harmonize the divine supremacy with the human agency. But it did so at the expense of the finite factor. By reducing man to a mere instrument in the hands of God, it left no true place for human freedom and responsibility. It endeavored to magnify the divine sovereignty by narrowing the purpose of the Saviour's work to a portion of mankind and denying the universality of his grace. It interpreted the fifth chapter of Romans by the ninth, and not the ninth by the fifth. It did not preach the Gospel in the fullness and freeness of the New Testament.

The modern Calvinism, since the days of Jonathan Edwards, has had for its object to bring the two factors in the Christian system into their true relation; not to break with the old but to supplement it, and to modify it only so far as is needful because

of this supplementing. The result has been a most important change, first in the preaching of Calvinistic ministers, and afterward, though more slowly, in the creeds and doctrinal systems of the theologians. The genetic principle of Calvinism, the supremacy of God in nature and grace, remains unimpaired; but the system has come to include the other side of the great truth, and thus has become a more scriptural and preachable system.

This result has been brought about by agencies working from within, and doubtless would have come had Wesleyanism never run its beneficent career. Yet unquestionably the followers of Wesley have all the time exerted a powerful and helpful influence upon their Calvinistic brethren. Through thick and thin they have maintained the side of truth that is complementary to the old Calvinism, the reality of the human element in Christianity. They, too, it is true, have often been exclusive and one-sided. They have not always done justice to the truth there is even in the oldest Calvinism. The *decretum horribile* has been too much a bugbear in their eyes. They have spent too much of their strength in fighting what have seemed to them the errors of their Calvinistic rivals; but they have emphasized with admirable constancy certain truths which can never be forgotten without detriment to theology and to the life of the Christian Church.

While, therefore, Wesleyanism has not deprived Calvinism of its great doctrine of the divine supremacy, it has helped to enlarge and correct it by keeping constantly in view the other side, which Calvinism has been so prone in the past to ignore. If it has not shaken the Calvinist in his belief in the divine election, it has made him ready to acknowledge that it is an election that implies and respects human freedom and responsibility. It has exerted an important influence in bringing about the larger and more scriptural view of the scope of Christ's redemptive work which prevails among Calvinists. If the latter are now generally ready to give their full meaning to the assertions of the New Testament that God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son for its redemption, that Christ tasted death for every man, and that God would have all men to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth, we must not fail to give the credit that is due to the influence of the persevering and consistent testimony of Wesleyans to the truth of these great Gospel doctrines.

BANGOR, ME.

GERMAN THEOLOGY.

THE RISING AND RULING SCHOOL.

[FROM A CORRESPONDENT.]

From *The Independent* (London), February 20, 1891.

MARBURG UNIVERSITY.

THE most important feature of the change in German religious life at the present time is a change which is coming over theological teaching. Of late years theologians in Germany have been engaged either in trying to explain Christianity on rationalistic principles, or in defending doctrines long accepted as revealed truth. The former, like all attempts to explain a higher nature by a lower, necessarily results in explaining Christianity away. The latter is equally unsuccessful, for it only uses the same weapons wherewith it was attacked—namely, those of the "natural man."

It was reserved for Dr. Albrecht Ritschl, late Professor in Göttingen (1889) to find a new basis of defence. Ritschl emphasised the fact that in Christian theology we have to deal with the thoughts of a new creature, the Christian, whose faith is just as inexplicable by the lower standard of the natural man, as the nature of the latter is inexplicable by natural law alone. Some new fact has entered with Christianity into human nature, which must be taken into account. This fact is expressed in the word Revelation. The speculative German mind, tired of its wanderings, finds the old way the best, and shouts again the old battle-cry of Revelation.

DR. HERRMANN, OF MARBURG.

At the present time the school of Ritschl finds one of its most distinguished representatives in Dr. Wilhelm Herrmann, Professor of Systematic Theology at Marburg, whose lectures during the present session are being attended by upwards of ninety students. Dr. Herrmann is a man whose face and very voice inspires his students with confidence and trust. Without veiling his meaning by any obscurity of language, Dr. Herrmann patiently tries to place the grand truths of Christianity before his hearers in such a way that they may appeal to reason and to heart alike. Old forms of thought are shown to contain the same spirit which animates every Christian heart, and the words of the early reformers lose their apparent harshness when the Professor explains their real meaning. To all Dr. Herrmann's theological teaching, however, there is one great presupposition,

which he sums up in the word "Revelation"—than which no word occurs with more persistent frequency in Dr. Herrmann's lectures.

WHAT IS REVELATION?

In order, therefore, to understand his system it is necessary to get a clear idea of what he means by Revelation; and this Dr. Herrmann takes especial pains to explain. The Revelation which makes us new creatures is neither mere knowledge obtained by reading the Scriptures, nor a blind acceptance of doctrine declared authoritative by an external and visible power, but it comes as an irresistible command to submission in the revelation by God Himself of His Almighty Presence. And how does this occur? Professor Herrmann answers that it is in particular, historical facts of life that we become conscious of God, and not through any system of philosophy, or any general view we take of the world. Here we touch the important point where Dr. Herrmann differs from many theologians. As hinted by Dr. Stuckenberg in his letter to *The Independent* some weeks ago, the Ritschl school rejects all metaphysical speculation, and this is Dr. Herrmann's own attitude. The knowledge of Himself which God gives us in Revelation is not an anticipation of the results of science or philosophy, but something utterly different in Nature. It follows from this that a philosophy of religion, as generally understood, must be regarded by Dr. Herrmann as unfruitful, if not impossible. "Philosophy," said Dr. Herrmann, in the course of a conversation some weeks ago, "can never lead us out of the world which is its sphere, for the world is infinite. We may as soon expect to reach a knowledge of God by way of philosophy or science as to reach the sky by following the road along which we are walking." Without Revelation we can do nothing. That this Revelation is no merely subjective imagination on the part of the Christian, he is himself able to

VERIFY BY THE HISTORY

of Christianity, where he finds ever recurring in various forms the same beliefs he himself experiences and the same motives by which he is influenced. From this standpoint Dr. Herrmann starts, and his Systematic Theology strives to answer two main questions concerning the man who is thus created anew by the self-revelation of God. These are: (1) What are the thoughts and beliefs which arise in this new life of the Christian, and the connection between those?

(2) What is the nature of the conduct of the Christian who has thus been born again? To answer the first of these questions is the task of Dr. Herrmann's *Dogmatics*; to answer the latter is the task of his *Theological Ethics*. The former is a psychological study of the Christian mind, while the latter is the study of Christian morality.

The only object of faith is God Himself, manifested and incarnate in Jesus Christ. Certain attributes we must ascribe to Him, certain new thoughts about His creatures must rise in our minds, and our new activity must take certain forms, but our faith is rooted and grounded in the Living God.

Such is the general attitude of the rising theological school in Germany. It remains to be seen whether it is powerful enough to counteract the forces which work against it. Independent of much of the historical criticism of late years, it presents at least a practical and positive teaching; and though we may not be disposed to agree at first sight with a total rejection of metaphysical speculation, we cannot but welcome a system which places us in certain possession of communion with our Father.

GENERAL BOOTH'S SCHEME.

PUBLIC INAUGURATION.

From *The Independent* (London), February 6, 1891.

A LITTLE more than three months ago General Booth issued his appeal, as contained in "In Darkest England," to the Christianity of the nation on behalf of the miserable and the outcast. He set forth a scheme and he accompanied it by a request for £100,000 with which to meet the necessary expenses. His book acted on the country as the spark on the touchwood, and England was soon ablaze with enthusiasm for the accomplishment of the great work which she was asked to undertake. So much so that the £100,000 is now more than subscribed, and the scheme is already fairly launched. On [Jan. 30th] the public inauguration took place. In the afternoon the Prison Brigade Home, in Argyle-square, King's Cross, which will be devoted to the reclaiming of gaol-birds, was opened. The prisoners received here will be taught one of about half-a-dozen trades, and it is hoped will be converted into industrious and honest citizens. General Booth, Mr. Illingworth (of Bradford), and others spoke, and with one exception, of a melancholy kind, the opening

ceremony was of a satisfactory character. This exception was the sudden death of Mr. Fleming, one of the largest subscribers to the scheme, who, while speaking, suddenly fell forward, apparently from excitement, and died a few minutes later from failure of the heart's action. The great event was the

PUBLIC THANKSGIVING

meeting at St. James's Hall, in the evening. Long before the time fixed for commencing the Hall was filled "from floor to ceiling" by a vast crowd of people, while from the beginning to the end, of the proceedings numbers, who could see nothing and hear little more, blocked the entrance and approaches. There was all the demonstration which is the characteristic feature of the Salvation Army, and which so largely assists in its success. To the playing of inspiring music by the vigorous Army band the various sections were marshalled on the platform in the public gaze. There were the bakers with those white caps which are the insignia of their office; the servants with their brooms; the nurses in costume; the slum brigade, with their salmon-pink scarves bearing the words "slums," and the rest, while the large poke bonnets of the "lasses" and the red jerseys of the "lads" all helped to add to the "effect," in which also materially assisted one or two of the Army natives of India dressed in the very observable costume of their race, and conspicuously placed. In the centre and at the front sat the General, whom a contemporary describes as "more grizzled than ever," and on his right hand and his left were many representatives of the public as well as the leading officers of the Army. After singing and prayer were concluded a number of the rescued, including an old convict in his ignominious dress freely marked with the broad arrow, and intimating that he came from Swan River, gave their experiences, ascribing their changed condition to the goodness of God and the noble work of the Army. A little fellow with a tin whistle, accompanied by a small orchestra of violins, played a couple of selections, and then General Booth spoke. His speech was, of course, full of congratulations and expression of gratitude. He announced that cash had been received to the amount of £64,562 15s. 6d.; and promises, £37,996 5s. 8d.; total, £102,559 1s. 2d. He defended his scheme and answered his critics, taking care to announce that his work was religious, and charging the religious organisations who were the chief objectors to its assumption of that character with the dog-in-the-manger

policy of neglecting the poor and the wretched themselves, and yet snarling at others who considered them. He appealed to the public for generosity in their interpretation of his work, and to a certain section of the Press for fairer treatment; and, finally, he set himself to solve one of the problems of the ages—"How to get rid of pauperism." Then was produced the famous trust deed, which is to make everything safe and legal. It sets forth explicitly the purposes of the scheme; makes the General of the Army for the time being the trustee, liable to legal proceedings for breach of the provisions of the deed, which it is stipulated can only be varied by consent of a committee consisting of six nominees of the General, and two by each of the following:—The Archbishop of Canterbury, the President of the Wesleyan Conference, the Chairman of the Congregational Union, the Chairman of the Baptist Union, the Attorney-General, and the Chairman of the London County Council, each of these six last named officials being allowed; if he chooses, to nominate himself. The deed, and the opinions of counsel upon it, were read by legal gentlemen representing the Army, and they gave the greatest satisfaction to the audience. In the presence of the meeting General Booth signed the deed, facetiously offering to sell the pen he had used. There was much cheering, and after a little more very vigorous singing, a meeting which will be a landmark in the religious and social progress of the century terminated. The trust deed and opinions of counsel have been issued in pamphlet form.

THE DENOMINATIONAL COLLEGE.

CHRISTIANITY NOT SECTARIANISM.

From *The Standard* (Baptist), Chicago, March 5, 1891.

FROM the able paper by Dr. H. D. Ganse in the *Inter Ocean* of February 23, alluded to by us last week, we take the following:

The visit lately made to our city by the respected president of Harvard University was so conducted before the public as to bring to notice some of the chief issues connected with the broad question of American education. That any such visitor, whether from Harvard, Princeton, Cornell or any other university distant or near, is at liberty to raise those issues before a community as large as this, is too clear to be debated.

If President Eliot was convinced, in par-

ticular, that a class of denominational colleges, of which very many are much nearer than his own, both to this city and to the hearts of the bulk of its citizens, are, for grave intrinsic reasons, not so worthy as Harvard to be entrusted with students and endowments, why should he not frankly make out his case? It was his unquestionable right; and one may be sure that so intelligent a visitor, in using that right almost within the echo of the walls of the Northwestern University (Methodist Episcopal), Lake Forest University (Presbyterian), and in the midst of the largest single interest of higher education that ever moved this city (the nascent Baptist University), had no thought that the courtesy due to a guest should forbid correction of any possible mistakes in his statement or argument.

WITH EQUAL FRANKNESS,

then, and with earnest purpose not to fall below the courtesy shown to the class of institutions thus discussed, I offer, first of all, some correction of Dr. Eliot's announced idea of a denominational college or university. In the interest of that broadening of religious views which the Harvard student is claimed to gain, he spoke by contrast of the "segregation of the youth of the country in distinct denominational institutions," and put forward as though it was a concession to the policy which he advocated and a proportionate departure from that which he opposed, the fact that "even in those nations of Europe which maintain established churches, the universities have abandoned the policy of confining their privileges to the members of that church." So far as that statement had pertinency in an account of American denominational colleges, it would imply that these were accustomed, if not of purpose, at least in effect, to exclude from "their privileges" such students of various religious faiths as "even" Oxford and Cambridge and the University of France had now come to admit. In fact, since every one knows (what Dr. Eliot declared) that Harvard for 200 years had remained "exclusively under the control" of the denomination to which it owed its birth, the broad implication of this part of his address was that the undesirable segregation had been steadily going on in Harvard until it tardily escaped such narrowness when passing to a new management, a generation ago.

Any grave correction of the implication so injuriously made or allowed will not be asked for. Could a more grotesque picture be conceived than that of Dr. Harper, when

he shall have successfully corralled in the new University of Chicago his thousand students, attempting to get upon each a neat denominational earmark? Every American college, by whomsoever founded and endowed, takes every respectable student that it can get; and the moment its wealth and fame are sufficiently increased, its attendance becomes cosmopolitan. . . . The smallest denominational college of the West is well-nigh sure to have students of several disconnected communions, and any change of fortunes that should make such a beginner as rich as Harvard, or Harvard as poor as the other, would not long leave a feather's weight of practical advantage on Harvard's side in the matter of "segregation."

Another material misconception of fact requires correction. What Dr. Eliot said about the denominational college or university as "a strict denominational organization;" about "the university of a sect;" about the importance of relieving education from a "denominational bias," could not but suggest to an uninformed hearer or reader the idea that the denominational colleges of the country are teachers of the distinctive theological tenets of their founders. Concerning all the notable colleges of the Protestant denominations that suggestion is entirely misleading. This writer, from his childhood identified with Presbyterian faith and polity, is an alumnus of Columbia college, whose relations to the Episcopal Church and to a predominant Episcopal management are not likely ever to come into question; and whose wealth and position afford illustration of what has just been said concerning cosmopolitan Christian colleges. Though his student days were far back of any liberalizing effect from the newest Harvard, they included no trace of the influence of "a strictly denominational organization" in favor of a "denominational bias."

IF CHRISTIAN PRINCIPLE

in trustees and faculty could be sufficient to forbid such manipulation of a pupil's faith, there are two other safeguards against such an abuse that can easily be understood and from which most denominational schools of whatever grade cannot get away. Very few of such schools are or have been the outcome of strictly denominational giving. Motive, that will soon be made plain, commonly combines all the Christians of the neighborhood, in organizing and housing, and gradually in endowing the Christian academy, college, or university for that re-

gion. That a Methodist, for example, should give liberally for the founding of a Presbyterian college, and thereafter, upon giving his children into its care, should find that attempt was made to proselyte them away from their home faith, to another "denominational" bias, would be a development that would disgrace ordinary commerce. And if Christian teachers would be willing to brave that disgrace, a last principle, which most Americans have shrewdness enough to consult—namely, policy, would keep the most blundering management from earning the damaging reputation of proselyters. To men versed in college affairs and whose knowledge suffers no eclipse by their undue advocacy of a side, these things are the alphabet of good management in denominational colleges. The old Harvard herself, near a century and a half before her final deliverance from so-called "sectarianism," accepted two endowed professorships from Thomas Hollis, a Baptist. Are we to believe that she thereupon employed that money in emphasizing the sectarian differences between the giver and the receiver? It is notorious that she did not. The Harvard of 1891 ought not to seem unaware of lessons taught so effectually on her own soil.

Having thus shown some important particulars, in which a denominational college is not what the President of Harvard suffered it to appear to be, we come to a more important discussion of that difference between such colleges and his own, which is not misconceived on either side.

THAT ESSENTIAL DIFFERENCE

concerns the importance—not at all of teaching in college any denominational shibboleths, but of teaching in college and university the fundamentals of Christian faith. Such a discrimination between fundamentals that must be taught and details that are matters of rightful personal variation, Harvard, like Princeton, Brown, and every other American college, is compelled to make in the matter of politics. To know from Dr. Eliot that Harvard "counts among its students Democrats and Republicans, free-traders, protectionists, spoilsmen, reformers, prohibitionists and high-license advocates," does not at all suggest that Harvard has no settled doctrine in the debate between despotism, or even monarchy, and republic; between nihilism and government; between property and agrarianism. On all these matters the university has a substratum of political certainty that is recognized in every class-room. A professor

holding and teaching the theories of Herr Most would find "affiliation" of that sort an insuperable bar to his entrance into that faculty. Are there any fundamentals of Christian truth that have as much right of recognition before an American student as the fundamentals of political truth? A very large proportion of thoughtful Americans answer, Yes.

The reasons for that answer will not be expected to be given here. But brief reason is here offered why as many as so reply are intent upon having the fundamentals which they accept included in every form of higher education which they employ or abet. Very many of them hold that that sort of recognition is the just due of truth which has been made certain by revelation of God, and which has relation to all human things. These same believe that the fundamentals of Christian teaching are of indispensable importance to the religious character of students as of other youth, and are also of special importance to students because of the signal uses which Christianity makes of educated men and women in the diffusion of its

RELIGIOUS AND ETERNAL BENEFITS.

But there is a further class of Americans who, without concerning themselves with the considerations thus named, hold fast to the teaching of the fundamentals of Christianity because of the demonstrated value of Christian belief and Christian ethics in the production of wholesome conduct. Without making any theological statement of the matter, Americans of this class to the number of many millions, believe in substance, and as firmly as they believe in the constitution or in any other unalterable ground of action, that as much of the Christian system as concerns God, responsibility and sin, Christ, grace, duty and eternal destiny, is at the root of the safest and noblest personal living; of the best home life, friendship and citizenship; of pure politics and the widest and wisest philanthropy.

It is when men of these views come together in a fit neighborhood, whether or not they be of one denomination, that they are prepared for neighborly co-operation for the founding of a Christian college. Since all experience has shown that the orderly and prosperous conduct of any such college is best secured by making some one denomination responsible for its management; and since the name of each controlling denomination has some considerable effect in attracting to it the students of that denomination, these two things happen: the neigh-

boring Christians of all denominations co-operate in behalf of their local college; the several denominations tacitly arrive at a fair distribution of localities and colleges among themselves. Then, as the time goes on, each denomination proves to be the chief provider of the college which it manages, yet with such notable and frequent overlapping of giving from one to the other as ought to put to the blush any effort to refer the support of denominational colleges to the spirit commonly known under the word "sectarian." That such spirit is wholly absent from the work of planting and sustaining denominational schools could not be said nor expected of a people as eager as this. But the proportion of rivalry on denominational account to Christian co-operation on Christianity's account does not rate so high among the American colleges of any note and influence as one to a hundred. Their great concern is to make a phalanx for the Christian fundamentals.

MOST NOTABLE ILLUSTRATION

of all that is here said is at this moment attracting the attention of Chicago and of the entire nation. This writer may speak of it without embarrassment, since he has no closer relation to it than has every other Christian. A university is just now incorporated here under the stimulus begun by one man's gift of \$600,000. That gift of Mr. Rockefeller has since been increased by him to \$1,600,000. Other men's gifts have been added until the aggregate of \$2,200,000 is reached. Concerning the trustees who are to have the management of this magnificent sum and of its further increase, the charter stipulates that "two-thirds, and also the president of the university, shall be members of regular Baptist churches," and it further stipulates that "this charter shall not be amended or changed at any time hereafter so as to abrogate or modify the qualifications of two-thirds of the trustees and the president above mentioned, but in this particular this charter shall be forever unalterable."

Three things lie in the face of this statement: That this new university is meant to be kept under the control of one of the leading Christian denominations of our country, that of the initial contribution to its means there has been enough supplied from that denomination to make all contributors of smaller amounts acquiesce very cordially in its position of control; that in so far as additional contributions are known to have been made, like that of Mr. Marshall Field, from beyond that same denomination, un-

derstanding is had (perfectly satisfactory, however tacit) that except in the divinity department of the university, which must be denominational, the course of instruction is to be untrammelled by any denominational bias.

Now this whole phenomenon, so recent and so notable in the educational sky, not only of our latitude but of our country, could not have failed to attract the attention of the visiting president of Harvard. Especially could he not be expected to take up and discuss in its presence and before a Chicago audience the theme of denominational colleges and universities without the utterance of some word, as graceful as candor would allow, in recognition of the breadth of this co-operative movement of Christians of different denominations in behalf of a Chicago university.

What stamps this whole assumption (President Eliot's general assumption on these questions) with its true character is its attempt to confuse the issue which it makes with the claims of Christianity by making ostensible assault upon "sectarianism." Any style of generalization that cannot detect these claims of universal Christianity in any category but that of "sect," should know that it condemns itself for lack, if not of fairness, then of discrimination. Writers who, making claim to accuracy, think they find need to speak of "sects" where there is no established church, understand that creeds and policies are in no sense "sectarian" except in so far as they differ from each other; that agreement in Christian matters defines the great body of the Christian church, and that no measure of disagreement or demur which unbelief, however learned, may manifest toward the bulk of Christian consent is entitled to make the whole Church "sectarian." But Dr. Eliot has a different vocabulary. The taint of "sect" takes hold of Christianity itself when it essays to go into a university,

LET IT BE NOTICED

that any denominational control of Harvard definitely ended in 1842; but a Christian control, in which the so-called "sects" were equal, lasted on until 1865. Then the last legalized trace of Christian predominance in the management of Harvard University disappeared. For the condition of liberty thus secured Dr. Eliot has no other name than "unsectarian." The lack of that sort of liberty it is that makes the "university of a sect" an impossible thing. Of course such a theory forbids Oxford and Cambridge to rate as real universities; for if they could transfer themselves and their teachings into

the American neighborhood of Harvard, the whole would at once become "sectarian" in the highest degree. Their present salvation is provided, to be sure, under the happy protection of a "National church." But if disestablishment shall ever come about in England, that hour, it would seem, would compel those ancient schools either to abandon Christian teaching, or to take up the hopeless endeavor of being "universities of a sect." Most American scholars believe that truth and knowledge do not hinge on latitudes and hierarchies, that Christ has long ago ceased to stand before the world's best learning as either an uncertain quantity or a species within a genus; and they will accordingly hail the younger Christian universities on Lake Michigan as they do the older on

THE CAM AND THE ISIS.

Still, it is well understood that to not a few persons, in Chicago as elsewhere, the Harvard definition of the relation of university study to the entire Christian question is thought to be in every way wise and right. With the holders of that opinion this article raises no issue. As many persons as thoughtfully wish the Christian fundamentals kept out of college and university work are acting intelligently and to good effect in throwing their sons and their means in Harvard's way. Those who do not share that feeling are to understand just what that issue is which Dr. Eliot has brought among them. It lies definitely between any teaching by a university of "Revealed Religion" and an attempted leadership in supplanting such teaching in all the Christian colleges and universities of our country. If the doctrine of Dr. Eliot's address and of his university's practice be true, the revealed religion of Jesus Christ has so little right to be taught in a university, even when it itself pays for the teaching, that it would be a thing to be commended in Yale, Princeton, Brown, Northwestern, Lake Forest, in the new Baptist University of Chicago, and in all their fellows, if, with needed legislative help, they should one by one put their presidents in position to recite how all the investments which those institutions had received in the distinctive name of Christ had come to be devoted to a kind of "pure education" in which Christ and his religion have no authoritative place. It is matter of general knowledge that sympathy with such an aim has been shown by some of the Yale alumni; but the intimation of Dr. Eliot's address that the effort had succeeded, and that Yale had become "unsectarian" in any other sense

than that of the catholic and Christian purpose applauded in this paper, has brought forth positive denial from those who know. Of the inheritors of Christian endowments Harvard holds her selected eminence alone.

God will unite the greater part of intelligent American Christians in making such an outcome of American Christian education possible only by exception.

THE WEAK BROTHER AS A BULLY.

BY REV. MARVIN R. VINCENT, D.D.

From *The Illustrated Christian Weekly*, New York, March 7, 1891.

No finer blending of wisdom and love can be found than that which appears in the eighth chapter of Paul's first Corinthian letter. The Church of Corinth was composite, consisting of converts from Judaism and from heathenism. Paul preached a gospel of freedom, which relieved the Jews of the exactions of the ceremonial law, and emphasized the authority of the individual conscience. To Gentiles, accustomed to the loose ethical regimen of paganism, this teaching was peculiarly congenial; but they showed a disposition to carry its applications to extremes. This was notably apparent in the matter of idol sacrifices. The sacrifice was not only an act of worship, but a social reunion. Friends met round the temple-table, and besides, to some of the poorer citizens, the feast which succeeded the sacrifice was a substantial boon.

To withdraw from the feasts was, therefore, in considerable measure, to withdraw from society. "Why," said the Gentile converts, "should we do this? We no longer eat as an act of worship. We eat the sacrificial meat as we would eat any meat, and so we commit no sin."

Paul replies: "Yes, you are right, so far as your individual liberty is concerned. To you, eating meat offered to idols is a morally indifferent matter. If you eat you are not the worse, and if you abstain you are not the better. But the real Christian test is not your keeping within the line of your individual rights, but your fulfilment of the great sovereign law of love. That law includes your brother with you. The question is how much do you love your neighbor; and consequently, how does the exercise of your individual right affect him? Grant that you do not sin in eating of the idol-meat. Grant that you eat without a thought of worship. Nevertheless, long habit has made it impossible for some of your Gentile brethren to partake without a consciousness of worshipping the idol. To them, therefore, such eating is wrong.

Now, if a man with such a consciousness sees you eating in the idol-temple—a man less intelligent and morally strong than you are—and is induced by his faith in you and by his respect for your superior knowledge to do what his conscience condemns, are you not the cause of his weak conscience being defiled, and his moral character thereby undermined? Is it not your duty to regard that weakness of his, to avoid fostering it, to concede your unquestioned right, and to abstain from that which may go to destroy him for whom Christ died?"

Such is Paul's reasoning, culminating in that magnificent utterance: "If meat make my brother to stumble, I will eat no meat while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to stumble."

But there is another aspect of this matter. Let us be sure that we clearly understand the Apostle's lesson. It is that surrender of individual liberty, in things morally indifferent, is demanded by the divine law of love, when refusal to surrender it is known to produce a *real moral injury* to a *weak* or *ignorant* brother. It is not that Christian liberty is to be at the dictation of a brother's wishes or whims, or even of his positive convictions of right or wrong. Paul's admonition assumes two things: first, ignorance; second, such respect for another's example, and such weakness as to lead one to follow the example to the wounding of his own conscience. To "cause to offend" is not to *give offence*, but to *cause to stumble*, as if, by putting a stone in another's path. Meat, or whatever it be, makes my brother stumble when it induces him to sin against his own conscience simply because of my example.

Through a failure to perceive this, a good many people have been included in the list of weak brethren, who have no business there. They are people who, so far from being weak, have sharp conceptions and very positive convictions of duty; who insist on forcing their convictions upon the practical acceptance of others, and who claim the right of the weak brother to extort from them concessions of individual liberty, so as to make their conduct square with their own ideas. Under these circumstances the "weak brother" writes himself down as a crank, a fraud, and a bully. He changes Paul's generous concession into imperious demand. He says to his brother: "Your meat does not please me, therefore you must not eat."

Now the man who has a conviction so positive and strong as to be proof against any example, is not a weak brother. The man who makes a *demand* on his brother

for the surrender of his liberty, is not a weak brother. He gives the best possible evidence that his conscience is well braced. The truly weak makes no demand for surrender. He does not challenge example, he follows it. A bully is a nuisance anywhere, and nowhere more so than in the Church; and this kind of a bully is also a fraud, because he plays the rôle of weak brother under the shelter of Paul's words, when all the while this weakling has his brother by the throat, and is bellowing "surrender!"

Every true Christian heart perceives the force and the beauty, and feels the stress of the Apostle's real injunction. It is our Lord's injunction over again: "Beware of causing one of the little ones to stumble." A true Christian will be on the watch for the little ones, just as a strong man, as he strides along, will keep an eye out for the little children at their play, and take care not to upset one of them, nor to tread on a little foot. A helpless child is an absolute monarch. Without knowing it, he commands the strongest man's patience and protection. But, sometimes, the little rascal, with impish precocity, detects the strength of his weakness, and avails himself of his littleness to tread upon the big man's toes or to stick pins into him, and then the big man, recognizing in the youngster something else than weakness, applies that which is not joyous but grievous, and serves him right.

Similarly there are times when the weak brother requires spanking (metaphorically) rather than coddling. There is no danger of destroying the brother by this process. In the region of conscience one is not destroyed by that which he fights; he is not made to stumble by the example which he challenges. His weakness is not a subject for special consideration when it takes up arms to dispute the passage of the stronger. Every one knows how tenderly our Lord dealt with the weak, even with the sinfully weak; but every one knows, too, how our Lord dealt with the insolent spiritual tyrants who tithed mint and anise and cummin, and laid upon other men's shoulders grievous burdens. The weakness of the weak brother sometimes runs into the exacting peevishness of invalidism. Patience and toleration in such cases should be mingled with tonic appliances: at any rate these are not the cases contemplated in this teaching of Paul. The attitude of the weak brother sometimes reminds me of a noisy, half-drunken fellow whom I once saw on board a Channel steamer, making himself generally offensive. At last he reeled up

to the Captain, and with an indescribable maudlin pathos, exclaimed: "Don't touch me, *I'm tender!*"

Some unfeeling critic has remarked upon the astonishing physical vigor displayed on the stage by dying heroes. An expiring bandit will perform phenomenal gymnastic feats; a statesman *in articulo mortis* will deliver an elaborate oration; and a feeble maiden, within five minutes of her exit from the world, will execute a brilliant cavatina abounding in vocal *tours de force*. It must be confessed that the antics of the weak brother occasionally develop a similar suspicious vigor. They furnish a new and striking interpretation of Paul's words, "When I am weak, then I am strong." There are times when the weak brother can exhibit as much "cheek," as much cool arrogance, as much impudence, as much venom, as much obstinacy, as commonly fall to the lot of stronger mortals.

In almost every religious community there is a tendency to impose certain prescriptions, often entirely irrational, but none the less insisted upon by a class of persons, larger or smaller, in the interest of religious propriety. No one can tell just where these things touch religious faith or character. Nevertheless, the laws of the Medes were not more inexorable, and to transgress is to wound some brother or sister who stands for the proprieties. Many will recall the days when a clergyman with a full beard was an object of unpleasant comment in certain religious circles, and when a minister with a mustache would barely have escaped ostracism. I have read within a year, in the columns of a well-known religious journal, a genuine old-fashioned diatribe against clerical Esaus.

I remember how, many years ago, a sweet, saintly woman whom I knew, was solemnly rebuked by one of the "pillares" for wearing too many kid gloves. Whether the "pillar's" weak conscience was wounded, or whether she feared that other weak consciences would stumble over the dainty little gloves, I cannot say. She professed high attainments in Christian holiness, but she had not learned the rudimental Christian duty of minding her own business.

For thirty-five years I have worn on the third finger of my left hand a plain gold ring which my wife placed there. I could not get it off now if I wanted to, and it will never leave my finger till the finger shall have crumbled to dust. I once went to preach in a country church somewhere in this State. A good many were present, and among them several ministers. Having preached the Word as well as I could, I

went home with one of the farmers to dinner, and then first discovered that I had been bringing the ministerial character into disrepute and "grieving" certain of the elect, and impairing the effect of my sermon. How? Why, by my ring! If I only would "take off that gold!" Incredible as it may seem, that admonition was actually given me, given solemnly, and I will add, kindly.

These are trifles, it may be said. So they are. So a mosquito is a trifle, but he is a very troublesome trifle. Somebody has remarked that he has "known a young hornet that was feeling well, to break up a camp-meeting." Now it does not take long for a few trifles of this kind to aggregate themselves into a social and religious tyranny which is as irrational as it is despotic. These things are not matters of wounding weak consciences. They have little or nothing to do with conscience. They are individual religious crotchets, used by certain conceited and self-assertive men, and by certain meddlesome women, as vantage points from which to thrust a hand into their neighbor's business, and to indulge their desire to manage and rule. They have no claims to tender dealing. They constitute a religious bullyism which may easily become intolerable. Christian people do the Church no service by submitting to this kind of thing. It becomes a duty toward the *really* weak for resolute Christians to check its first advances. There are not a few good people of both sexes in the Church, who would be the better for a vigorous object-lesson on the text, "Mind your own business."

Clergymen are sometimes wretchedly victimized by this kind of bullyism. There is not uncommonly in the congregation some man or woman who are sure that they know just what the minister ought to do and what he ought to avoid, and who take his life into their keeping and keep him under a constant fire of admonition or remonstrance. Brother Justus drops in on a Monday morning with a somewhat depressed and severe air. He would have his pastor understand that he speaks in all kindness, and solely with a view to his best interest and that of their beloved Zion (glancing out of the window at the meeting house, where three broken panes of glass are visible, besides a general lack of paint); but he feels it his duty to say that his playing at tennis does not seem to Sister Jones and Brother Squod to be becoming a minister of the Gospel. For himself, he is not sure that there is any harm in it. Personally, he would not object, but then, for the sake of peace and concord, remembering the weak conscience,

perhaps it would be better to refrain, etc., etc. And so it goes on. Another does not approve of the minister's skating, another thinks he ought to be in better business than playing the violin. Mrs. Saint Bullion shakes her head, and thinks the minister is going to extravagance in furnishing his house. It has a bad effect on plain people. The minister's life is made a burden. He is the slave of half a dozen parish bullies who are bulldozing him in the name of the Lord and of the weak brethren.

We cannot follow Paul's admonition too closely as regards tender consideration for moral weakness. The care of the weak conscience is a solemn and awful responsibility. But let us be sure that we are dealing with the *genuine* weak brother, and not with a strong, determined bully, *insisting* on surrender to the *rights* of his conscience. A little better understanding of this latter class, a clear exposure of their fraud, and a vigorous handling of their meddlesome tyranny will do much to clear the Church atmosphere.

ORIGIN OF TEETOTALISM.

MATURE VIEWS OF FATHER JEWELL, TROY, PA., FEB. 11, 1891, ON THE 88TH ANNIVERSARY OF HIS BIRTH.

From *The New York Evangelist* (Presbyterian), New York, February 26, 1891.

THE temperance organizations at the commencement of this century, in Massachusetts, Connecticut, and at Saratoga, N. Y., were simply moderation efforts (except on public occasions), and under a penalty of only about twenty-five cents. The movement in central New York was more far-reaching and abiding. Joseph Talcott, a minister of the Society of Friends, sent an earnest address to the Synod of Geneva, February 19, 1817, which was referred to a Committee, consisting of Rev. Messrs. Merrill, Wisner, and Lord. Their report was adopted as follows:

The members of Synod, having taken into consideration the communication of Joseph Talcott, are deeply impressed as they long have been, with the justice and weight of the sentiments it contains, and are happy to co-operate with the benevolent author in his labor of love.

That the members of this Synod will use all the influence they have to discourage the manufacture and the necessary use of ardent spirits.

That at every stated meeting of Synod, it will inquire what has been, and what can be done to abolish the damning and more than brutal sin of drunkenness.

At the meeting of Synod, February, 1818, Rev. William Wisner introduced the following, which, after much opposition, was adopted:

Resolved, That, the more effectually to check the alarming sin of intemperance, the Synod earnestly recommends to all its members, *wholly to abstain from the use of ardent spirits*, except for medicinal purposes.

Dr. Wisner returned to Ithaca, and delivered a thrilling discourse in the First Presbyterian Church, from Hab. 11: 15, "Woe to him that giveth his neighbor drink, that putteth thy bottle to him, and makest him drunken also, that thou mayest look on their nakedness." The next morning he found a tavern sign nailed up before his door! Nothing daunted, Dr. Wisner and his session on the fifth of March, adopted the following:

Resolved, That it is our unanimous and deliberate opinion, that the best interests of mankind for time and eternity, require that a speedy check should be put to the alarming and worse than brutal sin of intemperance.

That no very salutary reform is to be expected, so long as the great body of the professing friends of Jesus continue in any way to give encouragement or countenance to the manufacturing, vending, buying or using ardent spirits, except for medicinal purposes.

That we will neither use it ourselves, suffer it to be used in our families, nor furnish it to those in our employ, except for the purpose last above mentioned.

That we do earnestly recommend our brethren, the members of this church, to follow our example, as we do herein follow Christ.

These principles of the session were adopted by the church, and any violation thereof was made a disciplinary offence.

The next month, April 9, 1818, the Society of Hector (twenty miles west of Ithaca), was instituted on these principles:

We, the undersigned, being duly sensible of the pernicious consequences resulting from the use of intoxicating liquors, by annihilating the peace, happiness, health and prosperity of those who indulge in the practice of drinking immoderately and rendering them unfit to perform the duties of life, and thereby subjecting all connected with them in domestic relations to the most abject wretchedness, detracting from their usefulness in society, corrupting the morals of the rising generation, and finally destroying their existence in this world, and preparing them to spend a long eternity of misery and woe in the world to come; being also sensible that as citizens of a community where such an evil prevails to an alarming extent, as followers of Him who went about doing good, it is our duty to do all in our power to counteract its baleful influence, and put a stop to its further prevalence. And likewise believing that much may be done toward effecting this desirable object, with the blessing of God, by our united exertions, do hereby form ourselves into an organization; and in order the more effectually to promote this object, we adopt the following rules and regulations as the Constitution thereof:

This organization shall be known as the Hector Temperance Society, and its object shall be, as far as practicable, to prevent the improper use of distilled spirits.

And for this purpose, we solemnly pledge our-

selves to each other, that we will not drink any kind of distilled spirits ourselves, nor countenance their being drank in our houses by our families or others (except when they are necessary to restore health), nor give them to those employed by us to labor on any other occasion.

We also pledge ourselves, that when called to assist our neighbors in raising buildings, or in any other kind of business, we will not expect to be provided with such liquors to drink, nor will we furnish them ourselves when we invite our neighbors to assist us; and we will use our influence to prevent their being provided by others on similar occasions.

This Society has maintained an active, uninterrupted organization ever since. Of the twelve original members, six were communicants at first, and the other six soon became church-members.

An effort was soon made to reform two notorious inebriates. They joined the Society, and also the church. One fell by beer, and again by cider; the other fell several times by the use of cider, beer and wine. Then it was found hopeless to look for permanent reformation while fermented liquors were used. By the introduction of Teetotalism these ruined sots were, by the blessing of God, rescued and saved. September 26, 1826, Rev. Joel Jewell, then a young carpenter who had adopted the principle of total abstinence from all intoxicants, moved that our pledge prohibit wine as well as ardent spirits; which was adopted. In January, 1827, as Secretary of the Society, he introduced a double pledge, prefixing the letters O P to the name of those who signed the Old Pledge, and a T to the name of Total Abstinents. By explaining that T signified Total, they were at once called Teetotalers. Thus it was that Robert Armstrong and Harmon Kingsley became Teetotalers and steady Christian citizens five years before the word Teetotal was known in England.

Up to this time there were neither minors nor females in Temperance societies. August 22, 1829, the Secretary, scorning all opprobrious names heaped upon him, gathered 252 young people, of both sexes, from 15 years and over, into a branch organization on the entire abstinence principle. This is now the oldest Teetotal society; for in 1834, the one Secretary, in accordance with the unanimous vote of the two societies made the twain one. He that is called the "Father of Teetotalism," has always rejoiced in the enlargement of that only sure foundation. Hon. Ben. Joy adopted it in 1827, Hermon Camp in 1828, E. C. Delavan in 1829, Dr. Jewett in 1830, Father Hunt in 1831, and since 1834 a mighty host, good and true. May God soon give the victory.

LITERARY DEPARTMENT.

BOOK REVIEWS.

MODERN CRITICISM CONSIDERED IN ITS RELATION TO THE FOURTH GOSPEL: being the Bampton Lectures for 1890. By HENRY WILLIAM WATKINS, M.A., D.D., Archdeacon and Canon of Durham, and Professor of Hebrew in the University of Durham. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1890. 8vo, pp. xl., 502, \$5.

Apologetic literature is greatly enriched by the publication of the Bampton Lectures for 1890. The defence of the Fourth Gospel has become in large measure the defence of historic Christianity. Archdeacon Watkins has seized upon the strategical point of modern controversy. And he has been happy, not only in the choice of topic, but also in mode of treatment. In his prefatory note, telling of the genesis of his book, he recalls a conversation with the late lamented Bishop Lightfoot, which seems to have led to the preparation of these lectures. But he also indicates that the death of his beloved bishop well-nigh prevented the carrying out of his plan, since it threw upon him so much additional duty. Yet the volume needs no apology. The work is well done. While it covers many things, all of them are marshalled together for one purpose, which is effectively carried out. That purpose is, not to discuss the Fourth Gospel, nor yet the evidence in favor of its genuineness, but "to estimate the criticism which this century has produced." The author adds: "I believed before commencing these investigations, and believe now, with a confidence which does not fall short of certainty, that there is no foundation for the assertions which are so often made and accepted, to the effect that modern criticism is fatal to the claims of the Fourth Gospel; and I have tried to show this" (pp. x., xl.). This he has shown, and plainly indicated that every scrap of newly-discovered evidence goes to support the usual view of the authorship. The timeliness of such a book is evident. The genuineness of the Gospel has been attacked, not only in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, but in fiction, and in such quasi-critical or quasi-theological works as Martineau's *Seat of Authority in Religion*.

The plan of the book, though necessarily restricted by the conditions of the Bampton Lectureship, is an admirable one, easily grasped and historically valid. A remark of Keim's furnishes the text (or, at least, the textual divisions of the subject), "Our age has cancelled the judgment of centuries." Archdeacon Watkins applies this dictum to the Fourth Gospel and denies its truth in this application. Accordingly, he first of all seeks to ascertain what "the judgment of centuries" on the Fourth Gospel really is, and then what "our age" has done in cancelling it. Over against the negative criticism of "our age," there is set forth the positive criticism, and then "the additions which have been made to our actual knowledge by the discovery and investigation of mss. and other fresh materials." The concluding lecture aims to "consider the influence which modern thought should have on our conceptions of the Fourth Gospel."

It appears, then, that the treatment is, in the main, chronological as well as historical. What has been the opinion in past centuries? Has our age reversed this judgment? But the author found it necessary to deviate from the chronological order in opening the discussion. Inasmuch as the earlier part of the second century is the period respecting

which we are virtually called to decide, he properly hesitates to plunge at once into the disputed territory. "The judgment of centuries" is practically unanimous from the close of the second to the close of the eighteenth century. The real questions are: Do we in the nineteenth century know more correctly the facts respecting the authorship of the Fourth Gospel than did those who lived at the close of the second century? And if we do know better, does our knowledge lead us to reverse the judgment of the intervening centuries?

The first lecture, in addition to its clear statement of the issue and its suggestion of the treatment, contains an exordium on the tone of discussion. The lecturer rightly reprobates the animus of much that has been written on the subject, and with even better reason objects to the anti-theological prejudice of this generation, which assumes that in theology the experts are least qualified to judge, especially if they are earnest believers. The sublime folly of this age thinks Professor Huxley more competent as a biblical critic than Bishop Lightfoot, for example. Archdeacon Watkins does not say this, but it is a concrete statement of what he does say. He does, however, animadvert most plainly on the foolish assumption that in such a discussion as this we must seek to attain a "purely achromatic mental eye." A desire to know the truth, a willingness and fitness to act as judge, rather than as advocate, respecting it, these are the requisites. Only an angel or an idiot can have an "achromatic mental eye."

After this introduction the discussion begins at the point of time already indicated, the close of the second century. For convenience, that century is divided into three generations, and the inquiry starts with the third of these. This century is the only field of investigation, and the amount of labor bestowed upon it in recent times is immense. That the Gospel was universally recognized as the work of the Apostle John in the third generation is easily proved, and with the catalogue of witnesses in that age the first lecture closes.

The second lecture is devoted to the second and first generations of the second century. Justin Martyr, the Clementines, Valentinus, Marcion, Polycarp, Papias, and Basilides are cited as witnesses, the evidence sifted and the results stated. The author introduces here the newly recovered evidence (Tatian's *Diatessaron*, in particular), and speaks very kindly of the American scholar, Dr. Ezra Abbot, who first used this evidence to support the genuineness of the Fourth Gospel. In a later lecture these discoveries are more fully and specifically dealt with. As, however, the author intimates that German scholars ignore the labors of Englishmen, it may be added that, when the little volume of Ezra Abbot appeared, the *Athenæum* dismissed it with a notice at once brief and contemptuous. Fortunately some other Englishman discovered its value.

The third lecture briefly sums up the judgment of the sixteen centuries. There was little to be said, and the author has not wasted time in discussing what required no discussion. But the latter half of the lecture deals with a vexed question—namely, the principles on which the Gospel is received. The author seeks to define the relation of the Church to the Canon, without arguing in a circle. He opposes the doctrine of verbal inspiration, but fails to discriminate between the mechanical theory and that now held by the advocates of so-called verbal inspiration. In objecting to the former, he seems to be in danger of surrendering

too much. If this Fourth Gospel is "inspired in the essence of its inner realities, but not in the accident of its external form," who shall discriminate between the two. Textual criticism is valid, historical criticism is necessary; but when we have the accurate text and have established the genuineness, what next? Is the book authoritative as it reads, or is it only authoritative when some one has distinguished between "its inner realities" and "its external form"? The antithesis between "spirit" and "letter" is indeed suggested again and again in the Scripture, but this can scarcely mean that we can learn the spiritual reality by ignoring the external form. It is not necessary in this matter to divide in order to distinguish; it rarely is in things vitally connected. But the lecture closes with what may be deemed, from a rhetorical point of view, the finest passage in the volume. In feeling language the author pictures the testimony of two men, the Venerable Bede in the eighth century and Bishop Lightfoot in the nineteenth: "Such, in all the width of a *comprehension*, in all the depth of an *intention*, which I am able simply to indicate, is the 'judgment of centuries' upon the Fourth Gospel."

With the fourth lecture begins the review of what "our age" has to say on this great question. Two lectures are allotted to a sketch of negative criticism. The author, at the outset, demands that our age shall present something constructive, shall not only prove that the judgment of centuries is wrong, but present some substitute which adequately accounts for the facts. Beginning with Evanson, passing to Bretschneider, the author devotes about thirty pages to Strauss. The review of this remarkable man's career and opinions is singularly candid and even sympathetic. Rarely does an English Churchman enter so fully into the real life of a German critic. For that very reason Archdeacon Watkins's opinion is so valuable. He shows how the mythical theory was virtually killed by Baur, and that Strauss added little to the strength of destructive criticism against the Fourth Gospel.

Baur had been the teacher of Strauss, but the mythical theory was given to the world before the tendency theory was fully stated by its author. The sketch of Baur, with which the fifth lecture opens, is very interesting, though not so full as that of Strauss. The leading disciples of the Tübingen school are then named, and a just tribute paid to the "magnificent ruin," as this defunct theory is properly called.

The partition theory respecting the Fourth Gospel is represented in this lecture by fourteen names—witnesses enough to the variety of opinion allowed by this theory. "The Negative School" is the name applied by Archdeacon Watkins to the incongruous collection of other negative critics, German, Dutch, and English. To Davidson, as an English author, he gives most space, especially because of his change of views. Martineau is also assigned more attention than his work in itself deserves, since that author is not an expert in criticism, and his book is likely to influence only those not familiar with the more important contributions to the discussion. Against such a judgment as that of Martineau we can rightly place that of Ezra Abbot. The last negative critic named is Delft, who attributes the Gospel to John the Presbyter, an unknown, possibly apocryphal, personage.

The positive criticism is sketched in lecture six, seventeen German scholars being presented, from Schleiermacher to Franke. A long list of names

is inserted, which every scholar will recognize as "not merely a list of names." Happily the author has found a place for four Americans in this list. He, however, reserves for special notice four Englishmen—Bishop Lightfoot, his successor, Bishop Westcott, Dr. Salmon, and Dr. Sanday. That these four are qualified to express an opinion may well be conceded, though the last named is far too ready to allow weight to the opposing argument.

At this point the author has a word to say about the continental ignorance (or ignoring) of English scholars.

The seventh lecture, entitled "Recent Additions to Our Knowledge," is for the student more valuable than any other in the volume. What has been discovered, what has been reinvestigated during our age, virtually doubles the historic evidence in support of the Fourth Gospel. The *Philosophumena*, the Clementine Homilies, Tatian's *Diatessaron*, the new light shed on the Ignatian Epistles—all these evidences are for, not one against, the judgment of centuries. The author, of course, adds nothing to the mass of testimony, but he skillfully arranges it, and closes the whole discussion by an anti-climax or *reductio ad absurdum*—namely, the suggestion of a German, who has published four volumes on the life of Christ, and intimates that Judas Iscariot was the disciple whom Jesus loved and the real author of the Fourth Gospel. No consistent body of negative criticism has arisen in our age to cancel the judgment of centuries; this is the conclusion to which the author comes and which cannot be disproven until new evidence appears to the contrary.

Up to this point the volume is a demonstration. The appointed task is done; the goal is reached. Artistic unity would have been secured by leaving the matter unadorned with a hortatory and quasi-polemical conclusion. Not only so, but the last lecture does not seem to be as clear as other parts of the volume. Reasserting that the outward form is not inspired, the author admits more than a possibility of the admixture of human error, and asserts that the Word of God is "not identical with the written or spoken word of even inspired men."

The author accepts the Fourth Gospel as a tendency writing, and very skillfully arranges some of the paradoxical opinions respecting it. He insists that it is a "translation," in the widest sense, a Gospel for the place, Ephesus, and for the time, the close of the first century. But this position he uses only to show that it is a Gospel for all times—needing, however, to be "translated." His demand for leaders and leadership in this work is almost pathetic, though just what he desires does not seem clear at this distance. The practical conclusion is quasi-polemical. It sets forth how little scientific leaders have to say on what is so plainly said in the Fourth Gospel, how insufficient is modern ethical science, and finds in modern agnosticism a proof of the necessity of faith, to which faculty the Fourth Gospel appeals. It is the Gospel for all time; it sets forth its own purpose, "that believing ye may have life in His name." Because it is all the author proves it to be, it seems unnecessary to concede as much as he does of possible imperfection. "The judgment of centuries" past will probably remain the judgment of centuries to come, and the concessions of "our age" may disappear in the higher synthesis of a better doctrine of Holy Scripture.

No space remains to speak of the charming style of the lecturer, nor of the beautiful dress of the volume. The student will be thankful for the full

analysis contained in the table of contents and the exhaustive index at the close.

M. B. RIDDLE.

WESTERN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, ALLEGHENY, PA.

GOD INCARNATE. By the Right Rev. HOLLINGSWORTH TULLY KINGDON, D.D. Being the Paddock Lectures for 1890. New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1890. 8vo, pp. 252, cloth, \$1.75.

This volume contains a series of seven lectures, delivered during the past year by the author, who is the assistant bishop of New Brunswick, on the foundation of the *Bishop Paddock Lectureship*. The lectures were addressed to the students of the General Theological Seminary of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and are printed in accordance with the conditions of the Trust. They were designed to concentrate the attention of those candidates for Holy Orders on the fundamental truth of the Incarnation, together with certain related truths in the Christian scheme; and the aim of the author, as he states it, was not to present any original views, but to set forth these familiar doctrines in forms calculated to awaken interest and to deepen conviction.

Two of these lectures are occupied with a preliminary discussion of the Creator and the Creation; two others treat of the Incarnation as a process, and of the characteristics of the incarnate Saviour; one presents a view of the Atonement as the central act of Christ, and the two concluding lectures discuss the Sacraments in their relations to Christian experience, and the Gift of the Holy Ghost as the consummating feature in the development of redemption. This list of topics will make it apparent that the volume is, in fact, a condensed summary of the fundamental doctrines of grace from the standpoint of Christology.

After discoursing upon the existence, personality, and unity of God, and the doctrine of the Trinity, the author presents his view of creation in general, and specifically of the creation of angels and men, giving in his adherence under the last head to the theory of evolution, as affording, in his judgment, "the best solvent of all the phenomena that present themselves." His doctrine of the fall of man, and of the origin and nature of sin, is substantially that of the Thirty-nine Articles. The author inclines, on what we regard as insufficient grounds, to view the Incarnation not as an event rendered necessary by the fall and sin of man, but as a process essential to the personal and complete union of God with man as a moral creature, and, therefore, as provided for from the beginning in the constitution of man and in the nature of things. His subsequent presentation of the composite nature and the peculiar qualities of the Incarnate Deity, is largely, perhaps injuriously, affected by this opinion. Still, the exposition of what is termed the Perfection of Sympathy in Christ in the fourth lecture, is one of the most interesting and suggestive discussions in the volume. The view of the Atonement, which follows, is also interesting, as a terse statement of the orthodox doctrine of a true and satisfying sacrifice, having its source not in the wrath, but in the love of God, yet providing a real propitiation and ransom and reconciliation available for all the spiritual needs of all sinners.

In the lecture on the Sacraments there is much which only those can receive who view the Christian scheme from the sacramentarian standpoint only. While the author adheres mainly to the clear and strong statement of the Articles respecting

baptism and the Eucharist, he is inclined to make far more of the supper as a sacrifice, and of confirmation and absolution, the holy orders, matrimony, and extreme unction, than is consistent with the best teaching of his own Church. We view with extreme distrust every tendency in this direction. The discussion of the person and relations of the Holy Spirit is admirable, until we reach the matter of his residence and work within the Church as a spirit of wisdom and of growth. Here the author rules out all sects except his own as being "bodies that have separated themselves from the Communion of the Church," to whom there is, therefore, no promised indwelling of the Spirit, and only a general hope of salvation. This is an amazing position to take in such an age and such a country as ours, where only one in twenty-seven professing Christians is a communicant in the Episcopal fold.

We need not dwell on certain incidental points that have challenged criticism, such as the alleged preaching of Christ to the dead during his *descentus*, with its corollary of a probable probation after death. These are blemishes in a book which is, in the main, sound and healthful, stimulating in thought, vigorous in expression, and every way worthy of its place in the series of volumes produced through the Paddock Lectureship. The appendices at the close of the book, about forty in number, are very helpful to the reader; and one of them (M M, on the matter of confirmation), is quite valuable as a *résumé* of ancient opinion.

E. D. MORRIS.

LANE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

HAND-COMMENTAR ZUM NEUEN TESTAMENT. Vierter Band. Erste Abtheilung: Johanneisches Evangelium. Bearbeitet von Holtzmann. Pp. viii., 206. 3.00 mk.

HAND-COMMENTAR ZUM NEUEN TESTAMENT. Zweiter Band. Erste Abtheilung. 1-2 Thessalonicherbrief, 1-2 Korintherbrief. Bearbeitet von Schmiedel. 1 Hälfte. Freiburg i. B.: Mohr. (New York: Stechert, 1890.) Pp. 1-112. 1.20 mk.

Holtzmann's views of the origin and character of the Fourth Gospel are known through his introduction to the New Testament published in 1886. These views, firmly held for more than twenty years, appear now, unaltered, in his volume on the Gospel of John. The beloved disciple was not the author of the Fourth Gospel; the apostolic age, or even the first century, was not the period of its composition, and its character, save only in a slight degree, is not historical. John was a preacher of the circumcision; this Gospel is universal in its scope. The theology of the Fourth Gospel is not the primitive and Apostolic, but betrays the influence of Gnosticism. It was apparently produced in Ephesus. The tone of the writing supports tradition in this particular. Its Alexandrian and theological character, its references to Gnosticism, and the fact that it was first recognized in the Asiatic Church, are best accounted for by this hypothesis. Its traces of personal acquaintance with Palestine are consistent with the view that it was composed by a Jew of the Diaspora who had visited the holy places. Its catholic character and its close relation to Greek philosophy make it altogether probable that its author was a Hellenistic Jew. His education was both Jewish and Greek. His dependence upon the Stoic and Platonic philosophy shows that he belonged to those "denationalized, secularized, and spiritualized" Jews who

represented the union of Jewish religiousness and world-culture.

Regarding those passages of the Gospel which speak of the disciple whom Jesus loved, and which identify him with the author, Holtzmann's view is not clear. The disciple whom Jesus loved is perhaps typical of the normal discipleship. If so, Nathanael may have been the original.

Holtzmann admits that in the circle where the Gospel originated, there seems to have been a claim to the name of John the Apostle as author of the Gospel, but this is due to local patriotism, which regarded John as the head of the Church of that region.

The Gospel bears the stamp of dependency as regards the events which it communicates. Its value as history lies in this, that it gives us a glimpse into the development of Christianity in the second century, rather than in any addition it makes to our knowledge of Jesus. The essential features of the development which the Church had passed through in the first century of its history may be drawn from this Gospel. The element of personal reminiscence which is found in the Gospel may be derived either from the Ephesian John or from witnesses in Palestine.

The scope and character of Holtzmann's interpretation may be illustrated by his treatment of the marriage-feast in Cana. This story is regarded as an artistic doctrinal allegory. Water is the element of the Baptist. Jesus makes the symbol reality. The wine is symbolic of the spiritual life. A wedding is chosen by the author of the Gospel as the occasion when Jesus should turn the water to wine, because such a scene is in keeping with the joyous character of the Gospel which Jesus had to announce. The wedding company stand for legal Judaism. The mother of Jesus is the Old Testament congregation. The perfectly free manner in which the narrator here uses the traditional matter of the evangelical history is said to be characteristic of his method. In an independent, unembarrassed way he transforms many a letter of the historical narrative into stones for the temple of an ideal representation.

And it may be said, in all fairness, that what Holtzmann here affirms of the supposed author of the Fourth Gospel may with yet greater pertinency be said of Holtzmann's own method. It is characterized by a perfectly free handling of the materials of the Gospel history. In an unembarrassed and independent fashion he transforms many a letter of the historical narrative into building-stones for an ideal temple. If the author of the Fourth Gospel used history in such a manner that the actual realities, as recorded by the Synoptists, are scarcely recognizable, it must also be said that the old Gospel of John is scarcely recognizable in the theologico-philosophical Alexandrian doctrinal writing of the second century, which Holtzmann with great learning and infinite ingenuity seeks to interpret in the volume now offered to the public.

Schmiedel accepts First Thessalonians as genuine, but rejects Second Thessalonians. The first letter, while it does not give so much doctrinal matter as other Pauline Epistles, is second to none as a witness of the cordial relations which the apostle sustained to the churches. Our estimation of the value of the epistle should not be diminished by the fact that Paul was mistaken in expecting to witness the Parousia, or by the questionableness of the statements concerning the course of things at the end of the days. The chief argument against the genuineness of Second Thessalonians is found

in its eschatology. First, Paul's statement (2 Thess. ii. 5) that he had told his Thessalonian converts what should happen before the Parousia, is suspicious. There must have been a reference to these great events in 1 Thess. v. 2 f. Then the eschatological teaching of the Second Epistle is wholly inconsistent with that of the First. The figure of the thief and the travail-pain is destroyed by the Second Epistle, which assumes a long and gradual development of evil. Finally, it is decisive against the genuineness of the letter, that it presupposes the death of Nero. Its teaching concerning the man of sin rests upon the superstition that Nero would return. Schmiedel abandons his former theory that Second Thessalonians has a genuine letter of Paul as its basis, which was interpolated before the year 70 A.D. He now holds that the entire letter was composed by an unknown person between the death of Nero and the destruction of Jerusalem. He thinks its doctrine of retribution is not wholly Christian, but that it shows advance, as compared with the First Epistle, in the matter of the time of the Parousia.

Schmiedel discusses at great length the origin of Second Corinthians. He holds that there was an important letter between our two letters, to which the passage 2 Cor. x. 1-xiii. 10 belonged. This was incorporated in our Second Corinthians through some collector of the Pauline writings. He regards both epistles as genuine, and of the utmost historical and doctrinal value.

GEORGE H. GILBERT.

CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

THE WRITERS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. THEIR STYLE AND CHARACTERISTICS. By the late Rev. WILLIAM HENRY SIMCOX, M.A., Rector of Harlaxton. The second part of "The Language of the New Testament." (*The Theological Educator*, edited by the Rev. W. Robertson Nicoll, M.A., LL.D.). New York: Whittaker, 1890. Pp. viii. 190, 75c.

This little book, issued posthumously under the care of the Rev. G. A. Simcox, brother of the author, concludes Mr. Simcox's work, "The Language of the New Testament." The first volume dealt with matters purely grammatical, and with the New Testament as a whole. The present volume is concerned with the grammatical characteristics of individual books or groups of writings, and treats also of lexical differences. The text of the book occupies only 89 pages. The rest (101 pages) is given up to two appendices. The first of these deals with lexical differences and agreements between individual writers and groups of writers of the New Testament, and the second gives specimens of Hellenic and Hellenistic Greek, with notes illustrating the characteristic peculiarities of each.

The body of the work, under the caption "Individual Characteristics of the New Testament Writers," deals with seven groups, viz., The Synoptic Gospels, Luke, Paul's Epistles, the Epistle to the Hebrews (with its relations to Paul and Luke), the Catholic Epistles, the Fourth Gospel, and Joanneine Epistles, and the Apocalypse.

Luke's Gospel comes under consideration twice: once as one of the synoptic Gospels, and again in its relation to the Acts. Mr. Simcox agrees with the conclusion reached by all scholars, attributing both the Gospel and the Acts to the same writer—Luke. In fact, in none of the discussions germane to his subject does the author bring out much, if anything, that is new. He considers the Acts "of all the books included in the New Testament the

nearest to contemporary, if not to classical, literary usage." Paul is the typical Hellenist—that is, the writer of "Greek that is composed in Greek, and not a version of something written, spoken, or at least thought out in Hebrew or Aramaic; but which . . . is the composition of a Jew to whom *ἔθνη* means 'Gentile.'" Mr. Simcox quotes with approval Dr. Salmon's dictum: "The letter of St. James is perhaps the best Greek in the New Testament"—that is, taking its vocabulary into account. He thinks it less studied and artificial in its construction than either the Acts or the Epistle to the Hebrews. He concludes that James was used in the First Epistle of Peter and Jude in the second.

Our author has, in his discussion of the Epistle to the Hebrews, been led further afield than elsewhere. A remark upon the (supposed) affiliations of that epistle with the Wisdom of Solomon, and with Philo's writings, leads to a discussion of the Philonic authorship of Wisdom, which he rejects. He decides against the Pauline authorship of Hebrews, as he does against Origen's suggestion that Luke wrote it. His conclusion is that it was produced by one of a group of writers in very close connection with each other, and who produced Luke's Gospel and the Acts, the Pastoral and Catholic Epistles, and the Appendix to Mark's Gospel. In other words, Hebrews has decided Lucan, Pauline, and Petrine characteristics, and must have been written by some one in close connection with them all.

In his grammatical discussions Mr. Simcox has not the lucidity of style which makes the results he reaches stand out and impress themselves on the reader. One must follow the author with pen and pencil and state for himself the conclusions reached, or he will find himself rather befogged than enlightened as to the grammatical and stylistic peculiarities of the New Testament writers. Minute follow minutiae so closely that it is hard to keep one's bearings. Clear statement of principles is a desideratum sadly lacking. Of the scholarship of the author no doubt can be entertained, though he slips occasionally, as when he intimates that *ἐν τῷ*, with the Infinitive, is a purely Hellenistic construction, notwithstanding its use by Sophocles (*e.g.*, Ajax, 554-55).

Why is it that books like this are permitted to go forth without indexes? In the former volume there was an index of Scripture passages. In this one there is not even that. The time used in preparing indexes is so disproportionate to the added value of a book that there is no excuse for not making them. Were proper indexes prepared for the two volumes Mr. Simcox has contributed to the "Theological Educator" series, they would be much more valuable to students of the New Testament. They might even claim a place on the pastor's study-table, and be sought by the divinity student as real helps in his attempt to understand this portion of Holy Writ. The student who annotates his Greek Testament will find in this volume much which he can with profit transfer to the margin of his Greek text.

The publishers have done their part of the work well. The print is clear and typographical errors exceedingly rare.

GEORGE W. GILMORE.

BROOKLYN.

PERSIA: EASTERN MISSION. A Narrative of the Founding and Fortunes of the Eastern Persian Mission. With a Sketch of the Versions of the Bible and Christian Literature in the Persian and

Persian-Turkish Languages. By Rev. JAMES BASSETT. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1890. 12mo, cloth, pp. 353. \$1.25.

"Persia: Eastern Mission," is a full and clear presentation of the facts connected with this mission field. It is especially gratifying to have this subject treated by one who was a prime mover in the work which he narrates, and who is able to give an inside as well as a complete view. He gives us the sober facts without color or embellishment.

The first three chapters portray the character and present condition of the various nationalities dwelling in Eastern Persia, showing up their vices and their good qualities as well. The bulk of the book is taken up with the history of the formation and development of the mission work at Teheran and its out-stations, including the transformation of Hamadan into a full-fledged station, and the constitution of the Eastern Persia Mission. No doubt this part of the work could be greatly condensed without curtailing the information imparted, thereby giving a corresponding increase to its interest to the general reader.

Chapters XI., XII., XIII. treat of the methods employed, the difficulties encountered, and the encouragements experienced in mission work in the capital and its adjacent districts. Though some advance has been made and some changes have taken place since the author was on the field, yet the impression made by his book is a fair and true one. Chapter XIV. treats of certain problems, including the establishment of a Christian College at Teheran, which if carried to a successful issue would produce far-reaching and beneficial results.

The Author closes his book with many interesting facts in regard to the versions of the Persian Bible and portions thereof which have been made at different times, together with a reference to the beginnings which have been made toward a Christian literature in the Persian languages. Would that he could have presented a far better report of books already published, as they are so greatly needed!

But I am sure the author would have added to the interest in his book had he given the meaning of the many Persian words he has seen fit to employ. To the general reader many points will remain obscure for the lack of a clew to the purport of these words. The illustrations fairly represent the persons and places intended, but by some mistake the pictures of "Mechiel and his wife" and of "Carapet and his wife Victoria" have been interchanged.

This little book covers a field not hitherto occupied and is well worthy a perusal by those seeking information on this subject. It is a safe guide. Many additional points of interest will be found in the author's first book, "Persia: The Land of the Imams," to which several references will be found.

JAMES W. HAWKES.

(Hamadan, Persia.)

BALTIMORE, MD.

CHRISTIAN MISSIONS IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY. By Rev. ELBERT S. TODD, D.D. New York: Hunt & Eaton; Cincinnati: Cranston & Stone, 1890. 12mo, pp. 174, 75 cents.

It is the design of this interesting and instructive book, to "call attention to some phases of the many-sided theme of Christian missions, which seem to have been neglected;" to suggest some of the obvious lessons which the history of missions teaches, and "especially to call attention to valu-

able hints which they furnish concerning the question of methods." The book will well repay a careful reading. It goes over ground which is comparatively new. It is healthy and cheering in its tone and tendency. It will surely strengthen the faith of those who read it in the ultimate and complete success of the mission work. The author is broad in his sympathies and culture, and recognizes cordially all Christian workers in the great field, whatever name they bear.

The point, however, which he has specially in view is the "methods of mission work." The fact that the amount given by the churches, for the last decade, remains so nearly stationary, seems to him significant. It indicates that the limit has been nearly reached; that there is no reasonable ground to think that the Church will go largely beyond its present attainment in the method of work now adopted. There must be some new method, or rather, as the author thinks, the Church must fall back upon the old method under which it has won all its brilliant successes in the past. He puts in contrast the "Stipendiary Mission," in which the home churches, through an organized society, assume the support of the missionaries sent into the field, and the "Martyr Missions," in which the missionary goes into the field without any pledged support, relying upon his own exertion and the Providence of God for his livelihood. The latter method was, in the author's view, the apostolic method, and has been followed in all the great mission movements of the Church through the centuries. The most conspicuous advocate of this method in this country, as is well known, is Bishop Taylor of the Methodist Episcopal Church, of which our author is an honored minister.

Without discussing either the grounds upon which our author rests his view, or what is likely to prove true in the issue upon either method, it seems important to suggest:

1. That the word "Martyr" is not a happy term to designate any method of mission work. There is no reason why a man who goes out to the heathen under the auspices of a society or board, and lays down his life in his work, may not as justly be termed a martyr as one who goes unsupported, and dies in the effort to provide his own support, and possibly because he could not secure it. Why are not Bishop Hannington, Mr. Mackay, and scores of others, just as truly martyrs as one of Bishop Taylor's men, who falls bravely at his post working for his own livelihood in the intervals of his mission toil?

2. The method of mission work which implies that those who hear the call of Christ and go to the heathen, must do the work and be at their own charges, will be very likely to release the consciences of the great mass of church-members from their share in the work, and the sacrifice it involves. If the few who can go must not only take up and carry on the vast mission work, but at the same time earn their own livelihood, the many, who are at home, will not feel burdened with any imperative obligation. It needs all possible motives to bring even Christian men up to any great sacrifice or self-denial. It will be in the face of all experience if the burden is not left to rest upon the few. Whereas, upon the method now in use, the command of Christ binds every conscience; no Christian can be without his or her share in the work and its burdens without the sin of disobedience. It binds alike those who go and those who stay.

3. The work of the Church is one. We cannot

separate the mission work and take it apart, as if it was distinct in nature or was enforced by peculiar obligations.

Having said this, not so much in any opposition to the method proposed, but as a caution in adopting it, we commend the book heartily to our readers, with the assured conviction that its wide circulation will be fruitful of good.

ABRAHAM GOSMAN.

LAWRENCEVILLE, N. J.

THE PASTOR AMIDST HIS FLOCK. By Rev. G. B. WILLCOX, D.D., Professor in Chicago Theological Seminary. New York: American Tract Society. 12mo, pp. 186, cloth, \$1.

If good advice could make good ministers there would be few poor ones. The books which have been published within the last few years on preaching and pastoral work are so numerous and so excellent that one cannot help wondering what the professors of homiletics and pastoral theology find left to say to their classes. In fact, the question suggests itself to some minds whether this is not overdone. Would it not be better to treat the student of theology more as the student of medicine or law or military science is treated; that is to say, to teach him his subject, and then leave him to apply it for himself? The experience of others is valuable; but it is possible to think and speak too much of methods. If a man has anything in him it will come out of him, and his own experience will soon teach him more than he can learn from all the lecturers and all the treatises in the world. Something must in the end be left to his own common sense, and there seems to be some danger that our theological seminaries may commit the error of over-anxious mothers, who give their boys such minute instructions as to what they shall do and shall not do, that they are made not manly and self-reliant, but self-conscious and artificial.

This is the only possible objection to Professor Willcox's little book. It is chock-full of good advice—excellent advice—such advice as one would expect from a man so well balanced and of such large experience, who has himself been twenty-six years a pastor and eleven years a professor in this department. It does not consist of formal lectures, but is put in the form of a conversation between the professor, A, and his pupils, B, C, and D, though, of course, the professor asks as well as answers the questions. This gives, perhaps, a certain ease and familiarity to the discussion, and does not detract from its sobriety and earnestness. The talk ranges over every important topic relating to the life of a pastor among his people, such as *The Outset in the Work*, *The Pastor personally*, *The Pulpit*, *Organizing and Administering*, *Social Life of the Church*, *Among the Children*, *Church Financial Affairs*, *In the Homes of the People*, *Special Services*, and *Miscellaneous*. It is interspersed with anecdotes, illustrations, and bits of personal experience, and is thoroughly sensible from first to last. There are especially admirable chapters on *Candidating and on Resigning*, and many excellent suggestions may be found under the heads of *Office Bearers and Leading Members*, *Setting the Church at Work*, *Social Gatherings*, etc. In the chapter on *The Care of Health* the anxious mother appears. Such exhortations as these: "Avoid all messes that float in grease;" "take little pastry;" "eat slowly;" "be careful of the air in your sleeping-room;" and the information that "the teeth are injured, as is the stomach, by contact with very hot or very cold

drinks" seem to belong to an earlier stage in a young man's education, though some ministers who are no longer young might be profited by equally plain language on the subject of personal cleanliness. So too the advice to "live on what happens to be cheapest at the season;" "get winter clothing in the spring—fuel in June or July," and more of the same sort, is really too fatherly. But the book deals mainly with more important topics, and treats them in a broader way.

EDWARD B. COE.

NEW YORK.

MONTHLY BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS LITERATURE.

[Any of these books may be ordered through the Christian Literature Co.]

Acta sanctæ sedis, in compendium opportune redacta et illustrata studia et cura Dr. Victor Piazzesi. Vol. xxiii., 12 fasc. Rome, 1891, 8vo, 12 mk.

Acta sanctorum hiberniæ ex codice salmanticensi, nunc primum integre edita opera Carol. Smeit et Josephi de Backer e Soc. Jesu, hagiographorum Bollandianorum, aucto et sumptus largiente Joanne Patricio Marchione Bolte. Lille: Desclée, 1891. Pp. iv., 979, 4to, 2 col.

Ahnfeld, O. Den teologiska etikens Grunddrag. Föreläsen. Lund: Collin & Rietz, 1890. Pp. 172, 8vo, 1.75 kr.

Allen, Joseph Henry. Positive Religion. Boston: Roberts, 1891. Pp. xii., 259, 12mo, \$1.25.

Ambrose, R. G., Rev. Prayer Healing: Thoughts on St. James v. 14-16. London: Nisbet, 1891. Pp. 82, 12mo, 1s. 6d.

American Society of Church History. Papers of the—, Vol. II., New York: Putnam's, 1890. Pp. xxii., 104, 8vo, paper, \$1.50. Vol. III., 1891. 8vo, paper, \$3.00.

Bachmann, Johs. Præparation und Commentar zum Buche Hiob mit wortgetreuer Übersetzung. I. Heft. Kap. I.-III. Berlin: Mayer & Müller, 1891. Pp. 24, 8vo, 50 pf.

Badham, F. P. The Formation of the Gospels. London: Paul, 1891. Pp. 98, 12mo, 2s. 6d.

Barkley, H. A Ride through Asia Minor and Armenia, giving a Sketch of the Characters, Manners, and Customs of both the Mussulman and Christian Inhabitants. London: Murray, 1891. Pp. 346, 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Barth, J., Prof., Dr. Die Nominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen. 2. Hälfte. Die Nomina mit äusserer Vermehrung. Die gebrochenen Plurale. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1891. Pp. 209-492. 8vo, 10 mk.

Beet, Joseph Agar. A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles to the Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and to Philemon. New York: Whittaker, 1891. Pp. xii., 413, 8vo, \$2.00.

Bender, Adolf, Pastor. Die Stellung der evangelischen Christen zu der römischen Kirche. Berlin: Nauck, 1891. Pp. iii., 108, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

Berner, Alb. Frdr., Prof., Dr. Judenthum und Christenthum und ihre Zukunft. Vortrag. Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1891. Pp. 40, 8vo, 80 pf.

Bernstorff, Andr. Graf von. Die Briefe des Apostels Johannes. Kurze Betrachtungen für Bibel Leser. Berlin: Deutsch evangel. Tractat-Gesellschaft, 1891. Pp. iii., 64, 8vo, 40 pf.

Bettany, G. T., M. A., B. Sc. The World's Religions. The religious creeds and customs of the Egyptians, Persians, Chaldeans, Chinese, Australians, Indians, Eskimos, etc., reviewed and explained. With introduction by Rev. John Hall, D.D., LL.D. New York: Christian Literature Co., 1891. Pp. xii., 908, 8vo, \$5.00.

Bevan, Fr. Sketches of the Quiet in the Land; or, Lights in the Dark Ages of Protestant Germany. London: 1890. Pp. 440, 8vo, 4s.

Blunt, J. H. Dictionary of Doctrinal and Historical Theology. New ed. London: Longmans, 1891. Pp. 822, 8vo, 21s. Also, Dictionary of Sects, Heresies, Ecclesiastical Parties, and Schools of Religious Thought. New ed. London: Longmans, 1891. Pp. 650, 8vo, 21s.

Body, G., Rev. The School of Calvary: or, Laws of Christian giving Revealed from the Cross. A course of Lent lectures. New York: Longmans, 1891. Pp. xii., 159, 12mo, cloth, \$1.25.

Böttger, H. Sonnencult der Indo-Germanen (Indo-Europäer), insbesondere der Indo-Teutonen, aus 125 hebräischen, griechischen, lateinischen, und altnordischen Originalen und 278 sonstigen Quellen geschöpft und erwiesen. Breslau: Freund, 1891. Pp. xxxii., 167, 8vo, 3.50 mk.

Boixière, Ad., Père. Histoire et Examen de l'empirisme philosophique. Saint-Brieuc: Prud'homme, 1891. Pp. vi., 547, 16mo.

Brugsch, Heinr. Die biblischen sieben Jahre der Hungersnoth nach dem Wortlaut einer altägyptischen Felseninschrift. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1891. Pp. iii., 162, 8vo, 5 mk.

Burgess, O. F., Rev. Save the Masses: Educate, Evangelize. A paper read before the Methodist ministers of Minneapolis, Minn., with introduction by T. J. Morrow. Minneapolis: privately printed, 1891. Pp. ii., 30, 8vo, paper, 10c.

Burkhead, J. de Witt, Rev., D.D. Theology for the Masses: or, Bible Truths for all Men. Montgomery, Ala.: Holt, 1891. Pp. 343, 12mo, cloth, \$1.50.

Cameron, J. Freedom through Truth. London: 1890. Pp. 154, 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Campbell, John. The Hittites. Their inscriptions and their history. In two volumes. New York: Randolph, 1891. Pp. vii., 399; vi., 349, 8vo, \$6.00.

Carneri, B. Der moderne Mensch. Versuche über Lebensführung. Bonn: Strauss, 1891. Pp. xv., 186, 8vo, 4 mk.

Clarke, James Freeman. Life and Times of Jesus, as related by Thomas Didymus. Boston: Lee & Shepard, 1891. Pp. xiv., 448, 12mo, 50 c.

Clermont-Ganneau, Ch. Les Antiquités Sémitiques. Leçon d'ouverture faite au collège de France pour l'inauguration de la chaire d'épigraphie et antiquités sémitiques le 21 Mai, 1890. (Bibliothèque orientale Elzévirienne.) Paris: Leroux, 1890. Pp. ii., 63, 12mo, 65 c. net.

Cornelius, C. A. Kristna Kyrkans historia 5e. delen. Reformationstidevarfuet. Stockholm: Norstedt & Söner, 1890. Pp. 255, 8vo, 2.75 kr.

Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum, editum consilio et impensis academici litterarum cesaræ Vindobonensis. Vol. xxii. et xxiii. Inhalt: XXII. S. Hilarii episcopi Pictaviensis tractatus super psalmos, recensuit et commentario critico instruxit A. Zingerle. Wien: Tempelky, 1891. Pp. xxiii., 888, 8vo, 34 mk. XXIII. Cypriani, galli poetæ, heptateuchos. Accedunt incertorum de Sodomæ et Jonæ ad Senatorum carmina et Hilarii que feruntur in Genesin, de Maccabæis atque de Evangelio, recensuit et commentario critico instruxit R. Peiper. Wien: Tempelky, 1891. Pp. xxxix., 348, 8vo, 10 mk.

Croll, J. The Philosophical Basis of Evolution. London: 1890. Pp. 202, 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Dahlmann, J. Die Sprachkunde und die Missionen. Ein Beitrag zur Charakteristik der älteren katholischen Missionstheologie. (1500-1800.) Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 1891. Pp. xl., 128, 8vo, 1.70 mk.

Duerm, C. van. Vicissitudes politiques du pouvoir temporel des papes de 1790 à nos jours. Lille: Desclée, 1890. Pp. 460, 8vo.

Edersheim, Alfred, M.A., D.D., Ph.D. Prophecy and History in Relation to the Messiah. The Warburton Lectures for 1880-1884. With two appendices on the arrangements, analysis, and recent criticism on the Pentateuch. 2d ed. New York: Randolph, 1891. (Authors' edition.) Pp. xxiv., 391, 8vo, \$1.75.

Exell, J. S. The Biblical Illustrator: St. John. Vol. I. London: Nisbet, 1891. Pp. 694, 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Fava, A. J. Évêque de Grenoble. Vie de Jésus-Christ. Grenoble: Barlatier, 1891. Pp. 398, 8vo.

Fontaine, J. Le Nouveau Testament et ses origines du Christianisme. Études apologetiques. Laguy: Colin, 1891. Pp. xxiv., 520, 8vo.

Franke, C., Dr. Jesu Moral und der Jesuiten Moral. Leipzig: Fintel, 1891. Pp. 16, 8vo, 30 pf.

Freund und Marx' Präparationen zum Alten Testament. 3. Abtheilung. Präparationen zu den kleinen Propheten. 3. Heft. Habakuk (Schluss), Zephania, Haggai, Zacharia Maleachi. Leipzig: Violett, 1891. Pp. 161-243, 12mo, 75 pf.

Fürst, Julius, Dr., Rabbiner. Glossarium Græco-Hebræum, oder der Griechische Wörterschatz der jüdischen Midraschwerke. Ein Beitrag zur Kultur- und Alterthumskunde. Zweite und dritte Lieferung. Strassburg: Trübner, 1891. Pp. 49-144. 8vo, 3 mk.

Gardiner, F. Aids to Scripture Study. Boston: Houghton, M. & Co., 1890 (1891). Pp. xlii, 277, 12mo., cloth, \$1.35.

Girdlestone, R. B. The Foundations of the Bible: Studies in Old Testament Criticism. London: Eyre & S., 1890. Pp. 220, 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Gracey, J. T., Rev. (editor). Missionary Year Book for 1890-90. Containing historical and statistical accounts of the principal Protestant missionary societies in America, Great Britain, and the Continent of Europe. Rev. ed. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1891. Pp. 482, 8vo, cloth, \$1.25.

Grandpré Molière, T. B. Uitgebreide handleiding voor catechetisch onderwijs. 2 Dle. Zwolle, 1890. Pp. vi., 432; vi., 351, 8vo, 5.60 mk.

Gradowski, N. de. La situation légale des Israélites en Russie. Tom. I. (Du règne du czar Alexis Michailovitch au règne du czar Nicolas Ier.) Traduit du russe. Versailles: Cerf, 1891. Pp. viii., 348, 8vo.

Gordon, A. J., Rev., D.D. The First Thing in the World; or, the Primacy of Faith. New York: Revell, 1891. Pp. 32, 16mo, paper, 20 c.

Greenwood, H. General Booth and his Critics. Being an analysis of the scheme, and an inquiry into the value of the criticisms of Professor Huxley, Mr. C. S. Loch, the *Times* newspaper, and other critics, with an outline of the intended Trust deed. London: Howe, 1891. Pp. 128, 8vo, 1s.

Griffith, M. Josephine. Bible Temperance Studies for Evangelists, Bible Students, and Temperance Instructors. Containing a lesson on every reference to temperance or intemperance in the Bible. Chicago: W. T. P. U. (1891). Pp. 144, 12mo, cloth, 60 c.

Gronlund, L. Our Destiny: The Influence of Socialism on Morals and Religion. An essay in ethics. London: Sonnenschein, 1890. Pp. 168, 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Hansen, H. C. Moral, Religion og Videnskab. Kritisk Afhandling. Kjøbenhavn: Gad, 1890. Pp. 156, 8vo, 1.80 kr.

Harries, John, Rev. Does God Break his Pledges? or, Homiletical Germs on the Various Aspects of Prayer. With an introduction by the Rev. Thos. Champness. London: Stock, 1891. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Harris, Samuel Smith, D.D., LL.D. Thoughts on Life, Death, and Immortality. Selected from the unpublished writings of the late—, by Charlotte Wood Slocum. New York: Whittaker, 1891. Pp. 150, 12mo, 75 c.

Harris, W. T. Hegel's Logic: A Book on the Genesis of the Categories of the Mind. A critical exposition. Chicago: Griggs, 1891. Pp. xxix., 403, 16mo, cloth, \$1.50. (German Philosophical Classics.)

Hartmann, Eduard von. Die Geisterhypothese des Spiritismus und seine Phantome. Leipzig: Friedrich, 1891. Pp. iii., 128, 8vo, 3 mk.

Hartmann, F. The Life and Doctrines of Jacob Boehme, the God-taught Philosopher. An introduction to the study of his works. London: Paul, 1890. Pp. 336, 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Haupt, Die Pflicht der Kirche, die biblische Anschauung vom irdischen Gut im Gewissen der Gegenwart wieder lebendig zu machen. Vortrag. Nürnberg: Schrag, 1890. Pp. 31, 8vo, 40 pf.

Havet, E. Études d'histoire religieuse. La modernité des prophètes. Paris: Calmann Lévy, 1891. Pp. v., 264, 8vo, 5 fr.

Heisch, J. G. Reflections, Exegetical and Experimental, in St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. London: Nisbet, 1891. Pp. 244, 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Herron, George D., Rev. The Message of Jesus. To Men of Wealth. New York and Chicago: Revell, 1891. Pp. 32, 12mo, 20 c.

Hoffmann, J. G. E., Prof. Hiob. Kiel: Haeseler, 1891. Pp. 106, 8vo, 2 mk.

Hoffmann, P. La religion basée sur la morale. Paris, 1890. 18mo, 3.50 fr.

Holland, Roger. Méditations évangéliques. Tome II. Paris: Fischbacher, 1890. 12mo, 3.50 fr.

Hopkins, E. H. The Word Opened; or, Materials for Bible Readings. 1st series. London: Marshall, 1891. Pp. 114, 8vo, 1s. 6d.

Horton, R. F. The Book of Proverbs. (Expositors Bible.) London: Hodder, 1891. Pp. 4.8, 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Houchen, M. A. The Christ of the Bible, and other Addresses. London: Nisbet, 1891. Pp. 158, 8vo.

Hubbel, Nathan, Rev. My Journey to Jerusalem. Including travels in England, Scotland, Ireland, France, Bel-

gium, Germany, Holland, Switzerland, Italy, Greece, Turkey, Palestine, and Egypt. With sixty-four illustrations. New York: Hunt & Eaton, 1891. Pp. 311, 12mo, \$1.00.

Jacobs, H. Eyster. The Lutheran Movement in England during the Reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI., and its Literary Monuments. Philadelphia: Frederick, 1891. Pp. 390, 8vo, cloth, \$2.00.

James, W. The Principles of Psychology. London: 1890. 2 vols. Pp. 1376, 8vo, 30s.

Jastrow, Morris. A Fragment of the Babylonian "Dib-barra" Epic. Philadelphia: Univ. of Pa., 1891. Pp. 42, 8vo, boards, 60 c. (Univ. of Pa. Series in Philology, Literature and Archeology.)

Jeremias, Alfr., Dr. Izdubar-Nimrod: Eine altbabylonische Heldensage. Nach den Keilschriftfragmenten dargestellt. Leipzig: Teubner, 1891. Pp. viii., 73, 8vo, 2.80 mk.

Jewell, F., Rev. Holy Baptism; or, Head I., Part IV., of "Special Beliefs and Objects of Catholic Churches," fully considered. Milwaukee, Wis.: The Young Churchman Co., 1891. Pp. iii., 24, 8vo, paper, 10 c.

Jews and Gentiles. Being a Report of the Conference of Israelites and Christians regarding their Mutual Relations and Welfare. Containing papers by the Rev. E. P. Goodwin, D.D., Rev. Dr. B. Feiseuthal, Rabbi, Rev. Dr. E. G. Hirsch, Rabbi, Rev. J. H. Barrows, D.D., Rev. Joseph Stolz, Rabbi, Rev. J. M. Caldwell, D.D., Prof. David C. Marquis, D.D., Prof. H. M. Scott, D.D. New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell, 1891. Pp. 57, 8vo, 75 c.

Johnson, J. B. Things Present and Things to Come. London: 1890. Pp. 202, 8vo, 5s.

Keary, C. F., M.A. The Vikings in Western Christendom, A.D. 789 to A.D. 888. With maps and tables. New York: Putnam, 1891. Pp. xi., 571, 8vo, \$2.50.

Kennon, A., Rev. Principia; or, the Three Octaves of Creation. A new eirenicon. London: Stock, 1891. 8vo, 5s.

Knabenbauer, Jos. Commentarius in Daniele prophetam, Lamentationes et Baruch. (Cursus scripturæ sacræ auctoribus R. Cornely, et al. commentariorum in Vet. Test., pars III., in libros propheticos IV.) Paris: Lethielieux, 1891. Pp. vi., 524, 8vo, 6.80 mk.

Kniepf, Alb. Denken und Weltanschauung oder Theorie der Grundprobleme. Leipzig: Friedrich, 1891. Pp. x., 44, 8vo, 1 mk.

Kurrein, Adolf, Rabbi, Dr. Arbeit und Arbeiter im jüdischen Volke. Vortrag. Frankfurt a. M.: Kauffmann, 1890. Pp. 21, 8vo, 50 pf.

Lovell, A. The Ideal of Man. (On Fetichism, Polytheism, Monotheism, Moses and the Prophets, early Christians, science and religion, etc.) London: Chapman, 1891. Pp. 246, 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Ludwig, D. A. Quellenbuch zur Kirchengeschichte. Für Freunde derselben für studierende und praktische Theologen bearbeitet. I. Theil. Bis zur Alleinherrschaft Konstantins des Grossen. Davos: Richter, 1891. Pp. vii., 331, 8vo, 4.80 mk.

Lumby, J. R. The First Book of the Kings. With map, introduction and notes. (Smaller Cambridge Bible.) London: Cambridge Warehouse, 1891. Pp. 144, 18mo, 1s.

McCarthy, C. L. The Lost Tribes of Israel. Philadelphia: Lippincott & Co., 1891. Pp. 210, 12mo.

Mackinnon, James, Dr. Ninian and sein Einfluss auf die Ausbreitung des Christenthums in Nord-Britannien. Heidelberg: Hornig, 1891. Pp. 39, 8vo, 80 pf.

Mayer, J. V., Dr. Von der Freiheit. Eine philosophische Studie. Freiburg i. Br.: Stoll & Bader, 1891. Pp. iii., 120, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

Meignan, Mgr. Salomon: son règne, ses écrits. Tours: Mame, 1891. Pp. xii., 583, 8vo.

Messio, A. Le poème des Psaumes. Amiens: libraire generale, 1890. Pp. 267, 8vo.

Methodism and the Church of England. A comparison, by a layman. London: Griffith, 1891. Pp. 190, 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Meynell, Wilfred. J. H. Newman, the Founder of Modern Anglicanism, and a Cardinal of the Roman Church. New York: Catholic Pub. Soc., 1891. Pp. 116, 12mo, cloth, 80 c.

Meyer, Wilhelm, Prof. Petri Abelardi planctus I.-VI. Erlangen: Junge, 1891. Pp. 19, 8vo, 1 mk.

Moorhouse, James, Rt. Rev. Dangers of the Apostolic Age. Manchester, Eng.: Fargie, 1891. Pp. xii., 226, 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Morris, L. A Vision of Saints, fidelibus. London: 1890. Pp. 295, 12mo, 6s. 6d.

Mowat, Oliver, Hon. Christianity and Some of its Evidences. An address. Toronto, Canada: Williamson, 1891. Pp. 90, 12mo.

Müller, F. Max. Physical Religion: The Clifford Lectures Delivered before the University of Glasgow in 1890. London: Longmans, 1891. Pp. 422, 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Myers, W. H., Rev. The 19th Century Young Man. A series of lectures. Philadelphia: Lutheran Bookstore, 1891. Pp. 164, 12mo, cloth, \$1.00.

Natural Religion. By the author of "Ecce Homo." Seeley, J. R. (New ed.) London: Macmillan, 1891. Pp. 256, 12mo, 6s.

Nothnagel, A. Der Grandfehler der herrschenden Weltanschauung. Berlin: Bohne, 1890. Pp. 93, 8vo, 1 mk.

Olai, H. Om introduktionen eller den s. k. Kyrkotagningen. En pastorat theologisk studie. Lund: Gleerupska univ.-bokh., 1890. Pp. 83, 8vo, 1 kr.

O'Reilly, Bernard, Rt. Rev., D.D. John MacHale, Archbishop of Tuam. His life, times and correspondence. New York: Pustet, 1890. 2 vols. Pp. 1380, 8vo, cloth, \$7.50.

Orphal, H. Die religionsphilosophischen Anschauungen Trendelenburg's, dargestellt und beurtheilt. Eisleben: Winkler, 1891. Pp. iii., 76, 8vo, 1.25 mk.

Paget, Francis, D.D. The Spirit of Discipline. Sermons, with an introductory essay concerning Accidia. New York: Longmans, 1891. Pp. xii., 320, 8vo, cloth, \$2.25.

Palestine Pilgrims' Text Society. The Churches of Constantinople at Jerusalem: Being Translations from Eusebius and the Early Pilgrims, by John H. Bernard. With a preface by C. W. Wilson, and with an introduction and explanatory notes and drawings by T. Hayter Lewis. London, 1891. Pp. xlix., 38, 8vo.

Pearse, Mark Guy, Elijah. The Man of God. New York: Hunt & Eaton, 1891. Pp. iii., 120, 12mo, cloth, 50 c.

Petrie, W. M. F. Tell El Hesi (Lachisch). London: Watt, 1891. Pp. 60, 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Pollen, J. H. Acts of the English Martyrs, hitherto unpublished. London: Burns & O., 1891. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Quigley, K. F. Ipse, ipse, ipse, ipse, ipsum: which? (The Latin various readings, Gen. iii. 15.) Controversial letters. New York: Pustet, 1891. 8vo, cloth, \$1.75.

Quisling, J. L. Om aanderne eller englene efter den helige skrifts lære. Kristiania: Cammermeyer, 1890. Pp. ii., 172, 8vo, 2 kr.

Raimon, A. Dieu et l'homme. Paris, 1890. 8vo, 5 fr.

Rawlinson, Geo. Ezra and Nehemiah: Their Lives and Times. (Men of the Bible Series.) London: Nisbet, 1891. Pp. 180, 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Reddall, H. F. (Compiler). Golden Memories of the Book of Books, in Picture, Song and Story. Introduction by S. P. Newman, D.D. New York: Hunt & Eaton, 1891. 8vo, cloth, \$3.00.

Renan, E. The Song of Songs. Translated from the Hebrew, with a study of the plan, the age, and the character of the poem, done into English by William M. Thomson. London: (Thomson,) 1891. Pp. 178, 8vo, 1s. 6d.

Round, D., Rev. An Exposition of Jude's Epistle of Apostasy. London: Partridge, 1891. 8vo, 1s. 6d.

Sanford, Elias B., Rev. (editor). A Concise Cyclopædia of Religious Knowledge. Biblical, biographical, theological, historical and practical. New York: Webster, 1891. Pp. 1060, cloth, \$3.50.

Schopenhauer's, Arthur, Werke. Mit Einleitungen, erläuternden Anmerkungen, und einer biographisch-historischen Charakteristik Schopenhauers in Auswahl herausgegeben von Dr. Mor. Bräsch. 2 Bände. Leipzig: Fock, 1891. Pp. xxxii., 740; vi., 781, 8vo, 10 mk.

Schopenhauer's, Arth., sämtliche Werke in 6 Bänden. Herausgegeben von Ed. Grisebach. I. Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung. I. Band. Vier Bücher nebst einem Anhang, der die Kritik der Kantischen Philosophie enthält. Leipzig: Reclam, 1891. Pp. 667, 16mo, 1.50 mk.

Schürer's History of the Jewish People in the Time of Christ, Index to—. Translated by John Macpherson, M.A. New York: Scribner & Welford, 1891. Pp. xiv., 339, 8vo, \$1.50.

Schulte, Joh. Friedrich v., Dr. Die Summa des Panapalae über das Decretum Gratiani. Herausgegeben von —. Gießen: Roth, 1890. Pp. xxiv., 146, 8vo, 6 mk.

Schulte, Joh. Friedrich v., Dr. Die Summa des Stephanus Tornacensis über das Decretum Gratiani. Herausgegeben von —. Gießen: Roth, 1891. Pp. xxxii., 280, 8vo, 10 mk.

Schwarz, P. Reste des Wodankultus in der Gegenwart. Nach einem Vortrage. Leipzig: Neumann, 1891. Pp. iii., 50, 8vo, 1 mk.

Séché, L. Les derniers Jansénistes depuis la ruine de Port Royal jusqu'à nos jours, 1710-1870. Tom. I. and II. Paris, 1891. Pp. xxxvi., 300; 459, 8vo, 15 fr.

Seeley, J. R. See Natural Religion.

Segur, Marquis de. Les Palens et les Chrétiens. Lille: Desclée, 1891. Pp. 300, 8vo.

Sembrzycki, Johs. Die Reise des Vergerius nach Polen, 1556-1557, sein Freundeskreis und seine Königsberger Flugschriften aus dieser Zeit. Ein Beitrag zur polnischen und ost-preussischen Reformations- und Literaturgeschichte. Königsberg i. Pr.: Beyer, 1890. Pp. 72, 8vo, 1.80 mk.

Spurgeon, Chas. H., Rev. Sermons in Candles. Two lectures upon the illustrations which may be found in common candles. With an introduction by the Rev. R. S. MacArthur, D.D. New York: Armstrong, 1891. Pp. ii., 170, 12mo, cloth, \$1.00.

Stone, George M. The Public Uses of the Bible. A study in biblical elocution. New York: Randolph, 1891. Pp. vi., 189, 8vo, \$1.25.

Swift, E. Spiritual Law in the Natural World. London: 1890. Pp. 192, 8vo, 5s.

Taylor, William M., Rev., D.D. The Christians in Society. New York: Randolph, 1891. Pp. 31, 16mo, leatherette, 35 c.

Tourgee, A. W. Murvæ Eastman, Christian Socialist. London: Low, 1891. Pp. 546, 8vo, 6s.

Towner, D. B. Hymns New and Old. No. 2. For use in Gospel meetings and other religious services. New York: Revell, 1891. 8vo, 50 c.

Visible God, The, and our Relation to Him in Creation and Redemption. London: Hodder, 1890. Pp. 362, 8vo, 6s.

Wardfield, Benjamin B., Rev., D.D. The Development of the Doctrine of Infant Salvation. New York: Christian Literature Co., 1891. Pp. 61, 8vo, 35 c.

Weber, Theodor. Metaphysik. Eine wissenschaftliche Begründung der Ontologie des positiven Christenthums. 2. Band. Die antithetischen Weltfaktoren und die spekulative Theologie. Gotha: Perthes, 1891. Pp. viii., 581, 8vo, 11 mk.

Weill, A. Le faux Jésus-Christ du père Didon et les faux prophètes d'Ernest Renan. Paris: Sauvalre, 1891. Pp. 8vo, 50 c.

Weissbrodt, K., Dr. Gattenpflichten, nach Bibel und Talmud dargestellt. Berlin: Steinitz, 1891. Pp. 173, 12mo, 2 mk.

Wesley, John. Living Thoughts of —. A comprehensive selection of the living thoughts of the founder of Methodism as contained in his miscellaneous works, by Jas. H. Potts. New York: Hunt & Eaton, 1891. Pp. iii., 562, 8vo, cloth, \$2.00.

Whately, E. J. Doers of the Word. Thoughts on passages of Scripture bearing on daily Christian life. London: Stock, 1891. Pp. 126, 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Wilpert, J. Die Katakombengemälde und ihre alten Copien. Eine ikonographische Studie. Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 1891. Pp. xii., 81, mit 28 Lichtdr. Tafeln. 4to, 20 mk.

Windelbrand, B., Prof., Dr. Geschichte der Philosophie. 2. Lieferung. Freiburg i. Br.: 1890. Pp. 129-156, 8vo, 2.50 mk.

Witz, K. Etat des Zürcher Ministeriums von der Reformation bis zur Gegenwart. Zürich: Höhr, 1890. Pp. iii., 240, 8vo, 4 mk.

Worsley, H. The Dawn of the English Reformation: Its Friends and Foes. London: Stock, 1890. Pp. 362, 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Wray, Newton, Rev. Fun and Finance. A discussion of modern church novelties in connection with the subject of Christian giving, with an introduction by Rev. A. J. Gordon, D.D. Boston: McDonald, Gill & Co., 1890. Pp. 162, 16mo, cloth, 35 c.

Zeitlin, William. Gerithsepher. Bibliotheca Hebraica post-Mendelssohniana. Bibliographisches Handbuch der neuhebräischen Litteratur seit Beginn der Mendelssohn'schen Epoche bis zum Jahre 1890. Nach alphabetischer Reihenfolge der Autoren mit biographischen Daten und bibliographischen Notizen nebst indices der hebräischen Büchertitel und der citirten Antornamen. I. Hälfte. A-M. 2. Auflage. Leipzig: Koehler, 1891. Pp. iv., 248, 8vo, 7.50 mk.

Ziegler, H., Pastor. Der geschichtliche Christus. Vorbereitung und Erfüllung. Fünf Vorträge. Glogau: Fleming, 1891. Pp. vii., 117, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

NOTES OF MAGAZINES.

HARPER'S MAGAZINE for April, 1891, has these contents: "Cuirassiers" (illustrated; frontispiece); "The French Army" (illustrated), by General Lewal; "The State of Wisconsin" (illustrated), by Hon. W. F. Vilas; "The Mother" (a poem), by William Wilfred Campbell; "Wessex Folk," Part II. (illustrated), by Thomas Hardy; "Gillapes of the Bacteria" (illustrated), by T. Mitchell Prudden, M.D.; "Thomas Hood, Punster, Poet, Preacher" by Rt. Rev. T. U. Dudley, D.D.; "In the 'Stranger People's' Country" (a story), Part IV. (illustrated), by Charles Egbert Crowsell; "The Court Theatre of Meiningen" (illustrated), by Dr. Charles Waldstein; "Don Carlos" (a story), by Margaret Crosby; "The Behring Sea Controversy," by Hon. E. J. Phelps; "Mark Fenton" (a story), by Angeline Teal; "Argentine Provincial Sketches" (illustrated), by Theodore Child; "Silence and Solitude" (a poem), by Annie Fields; "Precedence in Vanity Fair," drawn by George Du Maurier; "Editor's Easy Chair," by George William Curtis; "Editor's Study," by William Dean Howells; "Monthly Record of Current Events"; "Editor's Drawer," conducted by Charles Dudley Warner; "Literary Notes," by Laurence Hutton.

THE ATLANTIC MONTHLY for April has these contents: "The Brazen Android" (in two parts, Part I., "A Story of Old London," by William Douglas O'Connor; "Easter Eve at Kerak-Moab" (a poem), by Clinton Scollard; "From my Window," by Olive Thorne Miller; "The House of Martha," XXVI-XXVIII., by Frank R. Stockton; "Arnold Winkelreid at Sempach" (a summing up of the evidence on the subject, with an inclination to believe his existence and daring deed; with also a fling at William Tell), by W. D. McCrackan; "Noto: An Unexplored Corner of Japan," XVII-XXI., by Percival Lowell; "A Thought" (a poem), by Thomas S. Collier; "Prehistoric Man on the Pacific Coast" (a study of the Nampa Image), by George Frederick Wright; "Nenia Amoris" (a poem), by Thomas William Parsons; "Capture of Louisbourg by the New England Militia, II," by Francis Parkman; "The Armenians and the Porte," by S. G. W. Benjamin; "The Muses in the Common School," by Mary E. Burt; "Cain" (a poem), by William H. Hayne; "Goethe's Key to Faust," first paper: The Prologues. By William P. Andrews; "Judaism and Christianity," James's "Psychology," Perry's "History of Greek Literature," General Cullum's "West Point Register," "Comment on New Books," "The Contributors' Club."

SCRIBNER'S MAGAZINE for April contains: "The End of the Voyage" (frontispiece, drawn by Charles Broughton; engraved by Peckwell); "Ocean Passenger Travel," by John H. Gould. Being the first article of the series upon Ocean Steamships. (Illustrations from drawings by O. H. Bacher, R. F. Zogbaum, F. C. Schell, J. D. Woodward, Harry Fenn, Victor Péraire, and W. B. Styles; engraving by Frank French, E. H. Del'Orme, C. L. Butler, E. Clement, W. B. Witte, and G. Del'Orme); "A Kangaroo Hunt," by Birge Harrison (illustrations from paintings by the author; engraving by T. H. Heard, H. W. Peckwell, K. C. Atwood, G. Del'Orme, and M. J. Whaley); "Horace, Book I., Ode XXI," in honor of Diana and Apollo, Dr. Philip Francis's translation, 1831 (the illustration by J. R. Weguelin; engraving by Henry Wolf); "Gaspar Nuñez de Arce," by Rollo Ogden (with portrait engraved by G. Kruehl); "The Meaning of the Dakota Outbreak," by Herbert Welsh, with a map of the Sioux Indian Reservation; "Spring Song," by Graham R. Tomson; "The Phoenix," by Bliss Perry; "What is Right-Handedness?" by Thomas Dwight, M.D., Professor of Anatomy in the Harvard Medical School (with numerous illustrations prepared under the direction of the author); "Where the Ice Never Melts"—The Cruise of the U. S. Steamer Thetis in 1880, by Robert Gordon Butler (illustrations from drawings by W. L. Metcalf and W. L. Taylor; engraving by E. H. Del'Orme and C. L. Butler); "Jerry," Part III., Chapters XIII-XIV. (begun in June, 1890, to be concluded in May); "The Relief of Captain Nelson," by A. J. Mountney Jephson, of the Emin Pasha Relief Expedition (illustrated by Frederic Villiers); "Night," by Archibald Lampman; "The Story of the Fresh-Air Fund," by Willard Parsons; "The Point of View." Cloisteral Criticism—As to the Long-Engaged—the Investigation of Crime.

THE CENTURY for April contains: "Mona Lisa," by Leonardo da Vinci, engraved from the original by T. Cole (frontispiece); "Salons of the Revolution and the Empire" (portraits), by Amelia Gere Mason; "Light," by R. K. Munkittrick; Poems by Charles Henry Lidders: "The Four Winds," "Under the Breaker," "Rain on the Peaks," "A Day in June" (Charles Henry Lidders died January 21st, 1891), by Frank Dempster Sherman; "There were Ninety and Nine," by Richard Harding Davis; "Fetichism in Congo Land," by one of Stanley's pioneer officers, by E. J. Glave (pictures by W. Taber after sketches from life by the author); "An Inflated Currency Act," by David Dodge; "Leonardo da Vinci" (Italian Old Masters, by W. J. Stillman, with notes and engravings by T. Cole); "Cold Cheer at Camp Morton," by John A. Wyeth (pictures by W. H. Shelton); "Early Intercourse of the Words-

worths and De Quincey," with hitherto unpublished letters, by H. A. Page; "Two Expeditions to Mount St. Elias: I. The Expedition of 'The New York Times' (1886), by Frederick Schwatka; II. The Expedition of the National Geographic Society and the U. S. Geological Survey, 1890," by Israel C. Russell (pictures by J. A. Fraser, after photographs); "The Twenty-third of April," by R. W. Gilder; "Colonel Carter of Cartersville" (conclusion), by F. Hopkinson Smith (pictures by E. W. Kemble); "Herr von Strieppell's Experiment," by Allan McLane Hamilton; "A Race Romance," by Maurice Thompson (pictures by E. W. Kemble); "To California by Panama in '49," by Julia H. Pratt (pictures by Gilbert Gaul, after drawings by Charles Nahl, made in 1850); "The Conquest of California," by John Charles Frémont; "The Official Policy for the Acquisition of California"; "Hardships of the Isthmus in '49," by A. C. Ferris; "Spanish Jealousy of Vancouver," by John T. Doyle; "The Faith Doctor" (begun in February), by Edward Eggleston; "And After," by Arlo Bates; "Washington and Frederick the Great," by Moncure D. Conway; "Topics of the Time"; "Open Letters"; "Bric-à-brac."

LIPPINCOTT'S for April has these contents: "Maidens Choosing" by Mrs. Ellen Olney Kirk. (This is the complete story of the number. The authoress has used the pen name of Henry Hayes. Are women obliged these days to adopt masculine names in order to obtain a hearing? Why do literary women commonly write their names so that strangers do not know whether they are married or not? Do they wish to be considered misses? Why do they commonly use initials only, so that their sex is disguised? These are questions which admit of, but probably will not receive answer.) "Some Familiar Letters by Horace Greeley," Part II., edited by Joel Benton (particularly interesting); "The Poet," "The Musician," "The Painter," by Miss Vernon Paul (poems); "The Elizabethan Drama and the Victoria Novel," by T. D. Robb; "Yarns about Diamonds," by David Graham Adey; "A Song of Changes," by E. C. White; "Brevity in Fiction," by Frederic M. Bird; "New Africa," by Charles Morris; "A Plea for the Ugly Girls," by Miss (?) E. F. Andrews (an amusing skit); "With the Wits" (illustrated by leading artists).

LITTELL'S LIVING AGE is a welcome weekly visitor. The numbers for March 14th and 21st contain: "The Paintings of Pompeii," *Edinburgh*; "Wit and Pathos in Suetonius," *National*; "Three Finnish Scholars," *Scottish*; "Turnerian Landscape—An Arrested Art," *Nineteenth Century*; "A Ride in Kaffrland, and Alexander William Kinglake," *Blackwood*; "Illustrations of Animal Life in Tennyson, and Ichia and its Earthquake," *Cornhill*; "Life in the London Slums," *Temple Bar*; "Statesmen of Europe," *Leisure Hour*; "Social Bath in the Last Century," *Murray's*; "Our Wildest Judge," *Belgravia*; "Wild Beasts and Their Ways," *Longman's*; "Our First Cousins, and Some Savage Contributions to civilization," *Chambers's*; "At the Regent Street Tussand's," *Punch*; "The South African Doctrine of Souls," *Nature*; "Robert Louis Stevenson on Realism and Idealism," *Melbourne Argus*.

The readers of this magazine can secure copies of Dr. Mombert's *History of Charles the Great*, a book of permanent value, the only decent biography of Charlemagne in the language, by sending him direct \$3.50 for each copy wanted. Mention this magazine and address Rev. J. I. Mombert, D.D., Paterson, N. J.

THE COSMOPOLITAN for April has these contents: "General Sherman" (frontispiece and article), by Murat Halstead; "The Eldest of the Arts—Darning" (illustrated), by Miss Elizabeth Bland; "Resurgam" (poem), by Frederic Peterson; "The President's Office and Home" (illustrated), by George Grantham Bain; "The Master of Genre—Meissonier" (illustrated), by George Edgar Montgomery; "The Nicaragua Canal" (illustrated), by Charles T. Harvey; "A Handkerchief" (poem), by John Patterson; "The Japanese Theatre" (illustrated), by Eliza Ruhamah Seidmore; "The Farmers' Alliance," by Senator W. A. Pfeffer (this article should be compared with Mr. Pfeffer's later speeches); "The Story of a War Correspondent's Life" (illustrated), by Frederic Villiers; "Farm Life," by a farmer's daughter—Miss Jennie E. Hooker (the winner of the first prize for such articles); "The Mystery of a Studio" (illustrated), by Robert Howe Fletcher; "The Future Conditions of Inventions" (comic illustrations), by Sylvester Baxter; "Current Events," by Murat Halstead; "Social Problems," by Edward Everett Hale; "On Certain Recent Novels by American Women," by Brander Matthews; "Compensation" (poem), by Miss Julia C. R. Dorr.

THE MISSIONARY REVIEW for April has these contents: "A Jesuit Mission in India," by Rev. Ed. Storrow; "Missionary Methods," by Rev. Dr. J. T. Gracey; "Ling Ching Ting," by Rev. Dr. S. L. Baldwin; "Why Missions are Modern," by Rev. Dr. D. L. Leonard; "London Papers and India's Women," by Mrs. J. T. Gracey; "Light in Darkest England," by Rev. Francis E. Smiley; "Creation according to Khas Traditions," by Rev. Wm. Williams; "Mission Work in the Scotch Athens," by D. L. Pierson; "The Telugu Mission," by Rev. C. B. Ward; "The Missionary's Shoes," by Rev. Dr. A. J. Gordon.